

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVI.

December, 1910.

No. 8.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVI.

December, 1910.

No. 8.

FRANCIS NORBERT BLANCHET, THE APOSTLE OF OREGON.

It is a long journey from Miramichi Bay on the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the metropolis of Oregon where the Willamette River mingles its waters with those of the great River of the West on its majestic course to the Pacific. And it were a long story to recount in detail the travels and labors of the Abbé Blanchet from his early missions among the peaceful Acadians and docile Micmac Indians of New Brunswick to his heroic work in planting the standard of the cross and establishing an ecclesiastical province in the Pacific Northwest. In the present article, the writer intends to trace in general outline the career of the Apostle of Oregon to the time of his episcopal consecration, with such incidents as may throw some light on the early Catholic history of the Oregon country. A second article will deal with his long and eventful episcopate.

The subject of our sketch was born on September 3, 1795, in the parish of Saint Pierre, Rivière du Sud, Lower Canada. He was baptized on the following day at the neighboring village of Saint-François, receiving the Christian name of François probably in honor of the patron saint of the parish church in which the ceremony was performed. His parents, Pierre and Rosalie Blanchet, belonged to old Catholic families,—many of the members of which had won honorable distinction in public life. A near relative of the future Archbishop, Fran-

gois Blanchet, M. D., was one of the founders of the first French Canadian newspaper, the celebrated *Le Canadien*, which was established to safeguard the civil and religious liberties of its countrymen. Another relative, a second cousin, Dr. Jean Blanchet, during the prevalence of the Asiatic cholera in 1832 and 1834, won the gratitude of the thousands of Irish immigrants who arrived at the port of Quebec while that terrible plague was raging. The Blanchet family had also given many members to the church. In a genealogical memoir before us are the names of fifteen priests and an equal number of religious in communities of women.

HIS EARLY EDUCATION.

The young François and his brother Magloire, afterwards Bishop of the diocese of Walla Walla (subsequently Nesqually and now Seattle), were sent to the parish school in the village of Saint-Pierre. The school was founded and directed by the pastor, Rev. Joseph Paquet, to prepare promising youth of his own and neighboring parishes for their classical studies. About the time that the two brothers entered, it was the custom for ecclesiastical students not in holy orders to be sent to the school from Quebec as instructors in Latin. In its brief existence of a dozen years, St. Joseph's College (for so the school was popularly called) was the nursery of a number of distinguished churchmen, a notable instance besides our two bishops, being the future Archbishop of Quebec, Mgr. Charles François Baillargeon. The young François and Magloire Blanchet entered as day scholars but the walk of four miles from their farm home to the school in the severe winter weather and especially the danger of crossing the river (*Rivière du Sud*) determined their parents to enter them as boarders. François made his first communion in 1808 (in his twelfth year) and was confirmed the following year, adopting the name Norbert which he afterwards used as a second Christian name. In 1810 the boys were sent to the minor Seminary of Quebec. During his classical and philosophical course, François won

distinction in his studies; we find him carrying off first prize in Latin composition and the pompous title of Imperator (first honor) in a competition in Latin translation. In 1816 he entered the Superior Seminary of Quebec and after a distinguished theological course was ordained to the priesthood on July 19, 1819, and celebrated his first Mass on the following day. The ordination ceremony was performed by Bishop Panet, coadjutor to Mgr. Plessis, the illustrious bishop of Quebec, during the absence of the latter in Europe.

THE ACADIAN MISSION.

During the year following his ordination the Abbé Blanchet was stationed at the Cathedral of Quebec as assistant. But Divine Providence, which had in store for him the arduous duties of a far western apostolate, selected a more suitable and effectual preparation for his life's work. The old mission of St. Antoine of Richibucto, New Brunswick, becoming vacant, the Very Rev. Bernard Angus MacEachern, Vicar General and bishop-elect for the Province and Islands of the Gulf, appealed to Mgr. Plessis to send him a French-speaking priest for the Acadians of that important mission. The lot fell upon the young Abbé Blanchet, who set out for his new field of labor in October, 1820. New Brunswick was formerly included in Acadia, the wrongs of whose people Longfellow has sung with so much pathos. The Micmac Indians were the original possessors of the land but the French had been their neighbors for a century and a half. With the energy which characterized him throughout life, the Abbé Blanchet set about restoring the village church, establishing catechetical schools and founding choirs. The better to minister to the wants of his Irish parishioners, he undertook the study of English and soon began to instruct the children in that language. He was much impressed with the mild, benevolent and docile disposition of his flock and to the end of his life was never weary of extolling their virtues.

The vast territory under his charge was a wilderness without

roads or bridges. "The Abbé Blanchet's mission, which was visited regularly at least twice a year, involved the travel of about 225 miles to reach the several stations, situated on rivers, bays and capes. In summer this was done in birch canoes along the rivers, in log canoes called pirogues, when crossing the arms of the sea, on horseback across country, and in winter on skates or snow shoes or in dog trains, and this in a region where the thermometer marks thirty degrees below zero and where for several months the earth and ice are covered with five or six feet of snow. The oldest inhabitants still tell (1880) of his heroism in storms and dangers of every kind; how he encouraged his good Acadian or Indian guides and shared with them their arduous labors and perils. His zeal never flagged, and after one of these long journeys to his distant stations, or after attending a sick call at a distance of a hundred or two hundred miles, he would return to his humble dwelling in the village as cheerful and joyous as did the Acadian farmer from his day's labor in his fields. Thus was the missionary being schooled for the duties of his apostolate in the wilds of distant Oregon." (Mallet, *Manuscript Memoirs of F. N. Blanchet*, p. 15.)

A feature of missionary life among the Micmacs that appealed strongly to the Abbé Blanchet was the annual pilgrimage of the Indians to the shrine of St. Ann of the Burnt Church which was an object of special devotion to all the neighboring tribes. At that hallowed spot on the northern shore of the great Miramichi Bay, the Indians of the whole surrounding country assembled annually to celebrate the feast of St. Ann on July 26. After weeks of elaborate preparation the various tribes arrived from their respective homes. The Micmacs in their best garments and in their newly painted pirogues decorated with flags and banners would form a flotilla and, amid the firing of guns, with their missionary at their head would start on their long journey to the north. The arrival of the Richibucto delegation was the occasion of special demonstrations among the Indians of the Bay. Then came eight days of religious exercises and instruction under the direction of

the pastor, Rev. Thomas Cook, afterwards Bishop of Three Rivers, Canada, ending with the general reception of Holy Communion on the feast of St. Ann. Scenes similar to this were to be common enough to our missionary in the Oregon country.

AT THE CEDARS.

In the spring of 1827 the Abbé Blanchet after seven years of missionary labor among the Acadians acceded to the request of an old friend, Mr. Lavingnon, to accompany him to Quebec. On his mother's death in 1821, shortly after his arrival at Richibucto, his old home had been broken up, and hence he expected only a temporary absence from his charge. His superiors decided otherwise and appointed him to the important parish of Cedars or St. Joseph de Soulanges in the Diocese of Montreal. The pleasant village of Cedars was not so much a center for a farming community as rendezvous for boats passing up and down the river. It was a great resort for travellers and voyageurs. Here our missionary came in contact with the current of life that was moving towards the west. The fur-trader and the adventurer who had dared the dangers of the Rocky Mountains and had come back with tales of the rich harvest to be won from trading with the western Indians were frequent visitors at the Cedars. Here too the heroism of the missionary was submitted to a severe test. In 1832 the dreadful scourge of cholera broke out in his parish and his ministrations knew no lines of creed. It was at this time that the non-Catholics of the place presented him with two large and beautiful silver cups in token of their admiration for his conduct in visiting the sick and dying.

THE OREGON MISSION.

We come now to the events which lead to the establishment of the Oregon mission. Up to 1731, although the French possessions and the diocese of Quebec were presumed to extend

into the interior to the uttermost limits of the undefined west, the country beyond Lake Superior and the headwaters of the Mississippi was still unexplored. An expedition projected in that year under the command of Pierre Gaultier, Sieur de la Verendrye, commandant of a post on Lake Superior, set out for the west and ascended the Assiniboine and its tributary the Mouse River in North Dakota. In 1743 the eldest son of La Verendrye led a small party ascending the upper Missouri to a point supposed to be near the present city of Helena, Montana. They were the first white men to discover the Rocky Mountains. The country thus opened up became the great fur land of North America. Beside the fort of the trader soon arose the log house of the colonist. When Canada passed into the hands of England in 1765, French settlements were to be found on the Red River, on Lake Manitoba and even on the mighty Saskatchewan. The Hudson's Bay Company at once opened its forts in the new regions and the Canadians, unable to maintain an unequal contest, retired to lower Canada. The organization of the Northwest Company in 1783, however, once more gave the Canadians standing in the country and they were soon found scattered from Pembina on the Red River of the North to Astoria (1811) at the mouth of the Columbia.

Meanwhile no priest had been in the Northwest country since Canada had passed under the dominion of England. In 1818 (the year before Abbé Blanchet's ordination) Mgr. Plessis, Bishop of Quebec, in response to petitions from the Catholic settlers in the Red River country drawn up at the suggestion of the Earl of Selkirk, sent two missionaries to instruct, or revive the faith among his neglected spiritual children of the upper country. These were Abbé Joseph Norbert Provencher, who was appointed Vicar General and chief of the mission, and the Abbé Dumoulin, his assistant.

The Abbé Provencher fixed his residence at what is now St. Boniface, Manitoba. Four years later he was elevated to the episcopate with the title Bishop of Juliopolis *in partibus*, the auxiliary of the Bishop of Quebec and Vicar Apostolic for the District of the Northwest. With this explanation we are in

a position to understand the events which lead to the establishment of the Oregon mission.

The arrival of missionaries and later of a Bishop had produced among the Canadians and half-breeds and Indians of the upper country a sensation which was soon communicated to the remotest posts of the fur companies. Just at this time occurred a cessation of hostilities between the rival fur-trading companies and their union under the general title of the Honorable Hudson Bay Co. with Dr. John McLoughlin in charge of the forts in the Oregon Country. (See *Cath. Univ. Bulletin*, Vol. xiv, No. 2.) It was under McLoughlin's direction that a number of the Canadian employees of the Company whose term of service had expired, were supplied with provisions and farming utensils to enable them to settle in the Willamette Valley on what has since been known as French Prairie. This was the first agricultural settlement in the present state of Oregon and became the nucleus of the large and prosperous Catholic settlement of St. Paul. Thus even the Canadians in distant Oregon heard the good news and longed for the coming of missionaries among them to re-animate their faith and reconcile themselves, their Indian wives and their children to the church. Their desires found expression in petitions which they drew up on July 3, 1834, and again on February 23, 1835, at the suggestion of Dr. McLoughlin. These petitions were directed to Mgr. Provencher and recited their sad spiritual conditions and begged that priests might be sent to reside with them on the banks of the Willamette. The Hudson's Bay Co. would provide transportation and the Canadian settlers agreed to support the missionaries. Mgr. Provencher in answer to these petitions wrote a pastoral to his spiritual children on the Willamette and forwarded it to them through Dr. McLoughlin. The Bishop tells them that he has no priests at Red River whom he can send, but that he is on the point of starting for Canada and Europe where he will make every effort to secure missionaries for them and for the Indian tribes about them. He exhorts them in the meantime to deserve by their good behaviour that God will bless his

undertaking. At the same time Mgr. Provencher wrote to Mgr. Joseph Signay, Bishop of Quebec, concerning the expressed wish of the Catholics of Oregon for missionaries. On the return of Bishop Provencher from Europe it was decided to send two priests to the new field and he at once entered into correspondence with Governor Simpson, of the Hudson's Bay Co. in London, for their transportation.

THE OREGON QUESTION.

The Oregon question had come to be a critical issue between the American and English Governments at this time (1837) and the officers of the Hudson's Bay Co. in London objected to the establishment of a mission in the Willamette Valley which, lying south of the Columbia River, was in disputed territory. Governor Simpson suggested that the mission be established north of the Columbia and Mgr. Provencher acquiesced in the suggestion. A letter of Governor Simpson to the Bishop of Quebec under date of London, February 17, 1838, sums up the correspondence:

"My Lords: I yesterday had the honor of receiving a letter from the Bishop of Juliopolis, dated Red River, 13th October, 1837, wherein I am requested to communicate with your Lordship on the subject of sending two priests to the Columbia River for the purpose of establishing a Catholic mission in that part of the country.

"When the Bishop first mentioned this subject his view was to form the mission on the banks of the Willamette, a river falling into the Columbia from the south. To the establishing of a mission there, the Governor and Committee in London and the Council in Hudson's Bay had a decided objection, as the sovereignty of that country is still undecided; but I last summer intimated to the Bishop that if he would establish the mission on the banks of the Cowlitz River, or on the Cowlitz Portage, falling into the Columbia from the northward, and give his assurance that the missionaries would not locate them-

selves on the south side of the Columbia River. . . . I should recommend the Governor and the Committee to afford a passage to the priests. . . .

"By the letter received yesterday, already alluded to, the Bishop enters fully into my views and expresses his willingness to fall in with my suggestions. This letter I have laid before the Governor and Committee and am now instructed to intimate to your Lordship that if the priests will be ready at Lachine to embark for the interior about the 25th of April, a passage will be afforded them, and on the arrival at Fort Vancouver measures will be taken by the Company's representatives there to facilitate the establishing of the mission.

Your Lordship's most obedient servant,

GEO. SIMPSON."

In the meantime the Bishops had selected the priests who were destined to carry the light of the Gospel into the new field. The Bishop of Quebec gave the charge of the mission of Oregon to Abbé Blanchet, still where we left him, ministering to his flock at Cedars. By letters dated April 17th, 1838, he was appointed Vicar General to the Bishop of Quebec with jurisdiction over the territory "which is comprised between the Rocky Mountains on the east, the Pacific Ocean on the West, the Russian possessions on the north and the territory of the United States on the south." Special caution was given him not to establish missions on the territory south of the Columbia, "the possession whereof is contested by the United States." The Abbé Modeste Demers, a young priest who had been ordained the previous year and who had been sent to the mission of the Red River of the North, was appointed assistant to the new Vicar General of Oregon. By an indult of the Holy See dated February 28, 1836, the Columbia country had been annexed to the Vicariate Apostolic of Mgr. Provencher of Red River.

THE JOURNEY TO VANCOUVER.

The journey from Montreal to Fort Vancouver occupied six months. The distance from Lachine to Red River (2,100

miles) was made with canoes with occasional portages from one river or lake to another in a little more than a month. At Red River the Vicar General passed a month with Bishop Provencher and took his departure in company with the Abbé Demers in July for the Rocky Mountains, covering the distance of 2,000 miles in less than three months and reaching the summit of the Rockies (between Mts. Hooker and Brown in Alberta) on the 10th of October. At 3 o'clock in the morning of that day the Vicar General celebrated Mass and consecrated—to quote his own words,—“to their Creator these mountains and abrupt peaks whose prodigious heights ascend toward heaven to celebrate the praise of the Almighty.” On the following Sunday, the caravan arrived at Big Bend on the banks of the Columbia, and the Holy Sacrifice was offered for the first time in the Oregon country, Abbé Demers being celebrant.

The remainder of the journey was made in light boats on the Columbia. Convenient stops were made at Forts Colville, Okanigan and Walla Walla (now Wallula). At this last post the missionaries were visited by the Walla Walla and Cayuse Indians among whom Dr. Whitman of the ‘Whitman-Saved-Oregon-Myth’ fame, was zealously working at the Wailatpu mission. At Fort Walla Walla their visit was made pleasant by meeting with a Catholic gentleman in the person of the commandant, Mr. Pambrun. The meeting with the Cayuse Indians here led to closer relations on subsequent visits of Father Demers to the Fort and a growing estrangement between the Catholic and Protestant missionary forces. From Fort Walla Walla, the flotilla set out for Fort Vancouver and after a week of slow and tedious descent of the Columbia arrived at their destination on Saturday, November 24, 1838. They were greeted by James Douglas who was acting Chief Factor and Governor of the Hudson’s Bay Co., west of the Rocky Mountains in the absence of Dr. John McLaughlin on a visit to Canada and England. They had arrived at the scene of their future labors. On this date therefore begins the history of the Catholic Church in the Pacific Northwest.

No sooner had the missionaries reached the Fort than they

were waited on by Joseph Gervais, Etienne Lucier and Pierre Beleque, a delegation representing the Canadians of the Willamette Valley. The settlers of French Prairie on hearing that the missionaries were coming, left their homes in a body and came to Vancouver to greet them. A delay in the arrival of the Vicar General's party, however, obliged nearly all to return disappointed, leaving only three to represent them and offer to the missionaries their grateful welcome.

The day following their arrival being Sunday, preparations were made in the school house at the Fort for the celebration of High Mass by the Vicar General. It was the first time that many of the Canadians present had been privileged to assist at the Holy Sacrifice for ten, fifteen or even twenty years. Tears came into their eyes as they reflected on the blessings which would be brought to themselves, their wives and children by the instructions and ministrations of the priests who had come among them. The employees of the Hudson's Bay Co. in active service at its 28 forts for fur-trade were for the most part Catholic; besides these were four Canadian families settled in Cowlitz and 26 families in the Willamette Valley. This was the nucleus around which the missionaries were to establish the Church in the Pacific Northwest. No flattering picture of the conditions confronting him is drawn by the future Archbishop. He writes: "Many of the servants and settlers had forgotten their prayers and the religious principles they had received in their youth. The women they had taken for their wives were pagans, or baptized without sufficient knowledge. Their children were raised in ignorance. One may well imagine that in many places, disorders, rudeness of morals and indecency in practices answered to that state of ignorance." (*Historical Sketches*, p. 62.)

AN EXTENDED MISSION.

Father Blanchet began his work by opening at Fort Vancouver for the Catholics of the place a mission which lasted with very little interruption from the end of November, 1838,

to the middle of April of the next year. A census taken at the time showed 76 Catholics at the Fort, including a number of Catholic Iroquois as well as the Canadian employees. During the mission especial attention was paid to the Indians. In the morning and evening Father Demers, who had mastered the Chinook jargon, taught them the prayers he had translated for them and in the afternoon about one hundred women and children gathered for instruction preparatory to baptism. While Father Demers was instructing the Indians, the Vicar General taught the Canadians giving instructions both in French and English so that some of those who were more apt were soon able to assist in teaching the prayers and catechism to others. The teaching of Gregorian chant was a matter of special pride with the Vicar General and he always mentions with satisfaction the solemn chanting of the services by the savages in his various missions.

According to the agreement already mentioned, between Mgr. Provencher and Sir George Simpson the Catholic mission was to be established on the Cowlitz River as the settlement on the Willamette (then called Wallamet) was in disputed territory. Accordingly the Vicar General left Vancouver on December 12 in a canoe paddled by four Indians and arrived at the Cowlitz settlement on Sunday, December 16. He celebrated Mass in the house of one of the Canadian settlers, Mr. Simon Plamondon. He chose for the mission six hundred and forty acres of clear prairie land and left his servant to square the timbers for a house and barn and to make rails for fences. On leaving he appointed one of the farmers, Mr. Fagnant, to teach the prayers and catechism to the women and children until the next visit of the missionaries.

The fact that no mission was to be established south of the Columbia did not deter the Vicar General from attending to the spiritual wants of the settlers who had first sent the Macedonian cry to the bishops of Canada. On his return from Cowlitz he spent his first Christmas in the West at Fort Vancouver, celebrating midnight Mass with great solemnity,—a custom which he never failed to observe. On January 3, 1839,

he set out for the settlement in the Willamette Valley a few miles above Champoege, near the present town of St. Paul. The history of this settlement is related by Archbishop Blanchet as follows:

ORIGIN OF THE WILLAMETTE SETTLEMENT.

“There remained in the country three Canadians, remnants of the old expeditions of Hunt and Astor, viz., Etienne Lucier, one of the former, and Joseph Gervais and Louis Labonte of the latter. Etienne Lucier being tired of living a wandering life, began in 1829 to cultivate the land near Fort Vancouver, and getting dissatisfied with his first choice, left it in 1830, and removing to the Willamette Valley, settled a few miles above Champoege, then called by the Canadians ‘Campement de Sable.’ Following his example, the two others followed him in 1831 and settled some distance south of him, one on the right and the other on the left side of the river. Some old servants of the Hudson’s Bay Company, being discharged from further service, went over to them and increased their number. The good and generous Dr. McLoughlin encouraged the colony and helped it all in his power.” (*Historical Sketches*, p. 75.) This was the community which had petitioned Mgr. Provencher for a spiritual guide. When the Vicar General arrived at Champoege he was provided with a mount and rode to the church which stood at a distance of four miles. The church, a log structure 30 by 70 feet, had been built in 1836, having been undertaken as soon as the settlers had received Mgr. Provencher’s pastoral promising them missionaries and exhorting them to the faithful practice of their religion. Father Blanchet took possession of a small room behind the altar and spent the afternoon in receiving visits from the people whose ardent wishes had that day been realized.

The following day, January 6, being Sunday and the feast of the Epiphany, the church, the first in the Pacific Northwest, was blessed under the patronage of the Apostle St. Paul, and Holy Mass, for the first time in the present state of Oregon,

was celebrated in the presence of the Canadians, their wives and children. For four weeks the Vicar General conducted a mission among them, instructing all, baptizing the women and children and blessing the marriages. Before leaving he took possession of a section of land around the church, because both he and the settlers had every confidence that Dr. McLoughlin would secure permission for the establishment of a permanent mission on the Willamette.

THE CATHOLIC LADDER.

After a few weeks at Fort Vancouver, the Vicar General set out again for Cowlitz and opened a mission there in the house of Mr. Plamondon on Passion Sunday, the 17th of March, 1839. The mission continued until Easter, the ceremonies of Holy Week making a deep impression upon all who attended. A device called "The Catholic Ladder," adopted by Father Blanchet on the occasion of this mission was to exert a wide influence in all the early Catholic missionary work among the Indians in Oregon. The news of the arrival of the missionary at Cowlitz caused numerous delegations of Indians to come from remote distances in order to see and hear the blackgown. Among these was one from an Indian tribe on Whidbey Island, Puget Sound, 150 miles from the Cowlitz mission. After a journey of two days in canoes to Fort Nesqually and an arduous march of three days on foot, across streams and rivers and by an exceedingly rough trail, they reached Cowlitz with bleeding feet and famished. When they were refreshed, the missionary began to explain to them the teachings of the Christian religion. In his *Historical Sketches*, Archbishop Blanchet gives the following account of the matter: "The great difficulty was to give them an idea of religion so plain and simple as to command their attention. . . . and which they could carry back with them to their tribes. In looking for a plan the Vicar General imagined that by representing on a square stick the forty centuries before Christ by forty marks; the thirty-three years of our Lord by thirty-three points fol-

lowed by a cross; and the eighteen centuries and thirty-nine years since by eighteen marks and thirty-nine points, his design would be pretty well answered, giving him a chance to show the beginning of the world, the creation, the fall of the angels, of Adam, the promise of a Saviour, the time of His birth and His death upon the cross as well as the mission of the Apostles. The plan was a great success. After eight days of explanation the chief and his companions became masters of the subject and started for home well satisfied with a square rule thus marked." (P. 85.) The same scheme was soon after worked out on a chart, at first simply, but later in a very elaborate manner. A copy of the chart in its final form as copyrighted by Archbishop Blanchet in 1859 measures five feet in length and two and a half feet in width. It is a veritable pictorial compendium of biblical and church history. The use of the Catholic Ladder spread very rapidly and a copy of the chart was to be found in every Indian camp visited by a Catholic missionary. In the absence of the priest the Indian chiefs took great pride in expounding the "Ladder" to their people. Father De Smet praised it very highly, and the view taken of it by the Protestant missionaries may be seen from the fact that they tried to counteract its influence by a "Protestant Ladder" in which the history of the Catholic Church was traced as the broad way that leads to perdition. It is certain that this concrete and pictorial presentation of religion was much better suited to the capacities of the savage than the abstract doctrinal methods employed by the Protestant missionaries and achieved more success.

MISSION AT FORT NESQUALLY.

While he was conducting the mission at Cowlitz, the Vicar General was informed that the Methodists were about to open an establishment among the Indians at Fort Nesqually. He immediately dispatched Father Demers thither, feeling that it would be easier to gain the attention of the savages before they had been exposed to hostile teachers. A ten days' mission by

Father Demers resulted in gaining the good will of the Indians, in bringing back to the practice of their religion the Canadian employees of the Fort and in the conversion of Mrs. Kitson, the wife of the Commandant¹ at Fort Nesqually, who thereafter acted as interpreter. Father Demers made arrangements to build a chapel at Fort Nesqually and hastened back to Fort Vancouver to take passage on one of the barges of the Hudson's Bay Co. for the Upper Columbia settlements. The summer months of 1839 found him giving missions at Forts Colville, Okanagan and Walla Walla to the great spiritual benefit of both the savages and the Canadians. In October Father Demers was back again at the Cowlitz. From a letter written at this time we get the interesting information that on the 14th of October he blessed a fifty pound bell and after having it placed in position, rang the Angelus,—the first time in the Oregon country.²

Meanwhile the Vicar General revisited the settlement on the Willamette and later conducted a successful mission at Fort Nesqually. At the former place no little excitement was caused by the antagonism of the rival missionaries. A number of marriages and baptisms were performed by Father Blanchet in cases where the Methodist ministers had already officiated. The ministers had also established a temperance society and had gathered in a number of the Catholics,—which would doubtless have been good for them had it not been made a means of perverting their faith. When the Catholic mission was established the Catholics withdrew from the society, much to the chagrin of the opposing missionaries. To disaffect the minds of the people towards the Catholic mission, a copy of the vile "disclosures" of Maria Monk was circulated in the community. When the true character of the book was made known, its circulation produced the contrary effect to that intended and it was quietly withdrawn.

¹ Mr. Kitson was received into the Church the following year.

² This was in the present state of Washington. The Vicar General had an eighty pound bell set in place and blessed at St. Paul two days before Christmas, 1839. This was the first bell to peal forth the Angelus in the present state of Oregon.

The first year of missionary life in Oregon closed auspiciously with notice from the Hudson's Bay Company that the Governor and Committee had reconsidered their objection to the establishment of a Catholic mission on the south side of the Columbia and that the missionaries were at liberty to make such a foundation on the Willamette. The news was conveyed to the Vicar General by acting-Governor James Douglas in the absence of Dr. McLoughlin in Europe. The change of attitude on the part of the Company was effected by the representations of Dr. McLoughlin while in London. McLoughlin returned to Fort Vancouver in the fall of 1839 and paid a visit to the settlement on the Willamette where he was greeted as a father. This was the occasion of his first meeting with the future Archbishop.

During the year 1840, our missionaries laid the foundation of two important establishments, the one at Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia, the other at Whidbey Island on Puget Sound. Father Demers reached Astoria on May 21 and on the following day pitched his tent among the Chinook Indians. At the time of his arrival, the ship *Lausanne* had just crossed the Columbia bar with the "great re-inforcement" for the Methodist mission on the Willamette. Father Demers "with a little bell in one hand and a *Catholic Ladder* in the other continued his mission for three weeks, instructing the adults, baptizing the children and doing much good." Meanwhile the Vicar General had made his way by canoe from Fort Nesqually to Whidbey Island on Puget Sound where he erected a massive cross (whence Commodore Wilkes called it Cross Island) and gathered the savages about him for daily instruction. There on May 29, 1840, he celebrated Mass for the first time north of the present city of Seattle.

ARRIVAL OF FATHER DE SMET.

The lives of the missionaries were eventful enough during the following years. Father Demers carried the standard of

the faith far north to Fort Langley on the Frazer River. Missions were opened for the Indians at the Clackamas, Willamette Falls (Oregon City) and Cascade settlements by the Vicar General. The work was growing apace. The score of establishments from Fort Colville on the Columbia to St. Paul on the Willamette and Fort Langley on the Frazer were taxing the strength of the two zealous laborers. Meanwhile they had been apprised of the presence of another missionary among the Indian tribes in the mountains. In 1840 Father De Smet came from St. Louis (see article on Father De Smet in the *Catholic World* for June, 1909), to the Flat Head tribe of the Bitter Root Valley in Montana. Learning from the savages of Father Demers visit to Fort Colville he had written to him and finally under date of August 10, 1840, sent a letter to Father Blanchet telling him that he would return the following spring to the Rocky Mountains and would make an effort to visit him. Nearly two years, however, elapsed before that meeting took place. It was not until June, 1842, that Father De Smet made his way across the mountains and down the Columbia to Fort Vancouver, and finally up the Willamette to St. Paul where he was welcomed by the Vicar General with open arms. A few days later they were at Vancouver in conference with Dr. McLoughlin "deliberating on the interests of the great mission of the Pacific Northwest."

As a result of the conference De Smet set out for Europe to secure more workers and supplies for the missions. A new field of missionary activity was proposed among the tribes of New Caledonia (British Columbia) and Father Demers was dispatched to lay the foundations. Demers pushed north after leaving the boats at Fort Walla Walla, past Fort Alexander on the Frazer River to Fort Stuart on Stuart Lake a thousand miles north of Fort Vancouver. Chief Factor Peter Skeen Ogden, who a few years later, succeeded McLoughlin at Vancouver and was so prominent in the rescue of the survivors of the Whitman massacre, was in charge at Fort Stuart. Mrs.

Ogden³ was a Catholic and through her kindness Father Demers found a more hospitable welcome than he could have anticipated. He celebrated High Mass at Fort Stuart on September 16, 1842, in a region hitherto outside the limits of Christianity. Before the end of the year he was back to Fort Alexander where he had a chapel erected by the Indians. In the spring of 1843 he returned to civilization in company with Chief Factor Ogden, riding on horse back from Fort Alexander through three or four feet of snow.

In the meantime recruits had come to rejoice the heart and aid the labors of the Vicar General. On the 17th of September, 1842, Fathers Langlois and Bolduc arrived at St. Paul from Canada via Boston and Cape Horn. On the following day (Sunday) High Mass was celebrated with deacon and sub-deacon for the first time in the Oregon Country. The new missionaries were not long in finding employment. Chief Factor Douglas set out in March, 1843, to found Victoria on the south end of Vancouver Island. He was accompanied by Father Bolduc. The party went to Fort Nesqually where they took the steamer *Beaver* for their destination. On Sunday, March 19, Father Bolduc celebrated Mass in the presence of more than one thousand Indians at the newly founded Victoria, and baptized over one hundred of their children.

Meanwhile the Vicar General had bought a lot at Willamette Falls (Oregon City) where he proposed that Father Langlois should build a chapel for the Indians. Dr. McLoughlin had spent the month of December, 1842, in platting his new town site of Oregon City at Willamette Falls. Settlers began to come in rapidly and the Indian congregation consequently melted away with even greater rapidity much to the disappointment of Father Langlois. Three years later Oregon

³The influence of the Hudson's Bay Company's officials in their dealings with the Indians was due in no small measure to their Indian wives. This was true in the case of Dr. McLoughlin and even to a more notable degree in regard to Ogden who had married an Indian princess. By blood and marriage Princess Julia was related to every important chief of the Northwest, making it safe for her husband to travel where no one else would dare to go.

City was to witness the erection of the first Cathedral in the Pacific northwest.

FIRST CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN OREGON.

In the Fall of 1843 it was decided to open a school at St. Paul and on the 17th of October St. Joseph's College (Father Blanchet remembered the old school he had attended as a boy at Rivière du Sud) was blessed with solemn ceremony in the presence of a large concourse of people. Father Langlois was placed in charge. On the first day thirty boys entered as boarders, sons of the farmers, except one Indian boy, the son of a chief. Some distance from the college there was in the process of erection a convent for the Sisters who were expected to arrive with Father De Smet. In October of the same year Father Blanchet accompanied Dr. McLoughlin to Oregon City and selected a block for a Catholic church,—the site of the present St. John's Church and McLoughlin Institute, Oregon City. Early in 1844 the first pastor of Oregon City was appointed in the person of Father Demers, who celebrated Mass there for the first time on Sunday, March 3, of that year.

A second reinforcement for the Catholic missions came early in August when Father De Smet returned from Europe accompanied by four priests of the Society and by six Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur.

Father De Smet at once established the mission of St. Francis Xavier on a site donated for that purpose by the Vicar General. The Sisters of Notre Dame also took possession of the convent which was under construction in preparation for their arrival, but which, unfortunately, owing to the scarcity of mechanics, was still wanting in doors and sashes. The Sisters were soon initiated into the requirements of pioneer life. One might be seen handling the plane, another glazing, and still others painting the windows and doors. Thirty children of the Canadian farmers were quickly enrolled in the new Academy. The Sisters took possession of their new convent

early in the month of October and a few days later their humble chapel was solemnly consecrated by Father Blanchet. So immediate was the success of the Sisters that Father De Smet writing under date of October 9, 1844, says that another foundation was projected at "Cuhute." This was probably Oregon City. At all events the Sisters opened their second school in Oregon at that place in the fall of 1848. The subsequent history of these pioneer schools belongs to a later place in our narrative.

EARLY OREGON POLITICS.

While Father Blanchet was zealously directing the spiritual affairs of the vast territory committed to his care, political changes were taking place which brought him temporarily into public view. To understand his attitude towards the Provisional government we must take a hasty survey of the political situation of the time. The Oregon Country was in a state of "Joint Occupancy," that is the dividing line between British and American possessions had not yet been determined and under a Convention of 1818, again renewed in 1826, the country was to be "free and open to the vessels, citizens and subjects of the two powers." They were not, however, equally protected. The powerful Hudson's Bay Company exercised police protection over the British subjects and the English Parliament had extended the Colonial jurisdiction and civil laws of Canada over all British subjects on the coast. As for the American settlers, a writer has appropriately applied them the words: "In those days there was no king in Israel and everyone did whatsoever was right in his own eyes." In 1840 a number of the American emigrants addressed a petition to Congress asking that body to extend the protection of American civil institutions. There was no prospect of favorable action by Congress when an event occurred which brought the necessity of a civil government again before the minds of the American settlers. On February 15, 1841, Ewing Young, the pioneer stockman of the Willamette Valley, died intestate. A

meeting was called to settle the disposition of the estate. At this meeting it was recommended that a committee be appointed to draft a constitution and a code of laws for the government of the settlements south of the Columbia River, and a resolution was passed that settlers north of the Columbia not connected with the Hudson's Bay Co. might be admitted to the protection of the laws of the proposed government. Another meeting was called for the next day to elect officers and to select the committee. The committee appointed on the following day was headed by Father Blanchet as chairman, contrary to his own wishes. The selection of Father Blanchet for this position was doubtless due to a desire to gain the support of the Canadian settlers for the proposed government, there being in the entire settlement at this time about one hundred and forty Americans and sixty Canadians. The Canadians were, as we have said, protected by the Canadian government and were in a special manner indebted to the Hudson's Bay Co. They were for the most part old employees of the Company and had received material assistance from Dr. McLoughlin since their retirement from service. The committee was to report at a meeting on June 1 following, but when the appointed time arrived Father Blanchet announced that he had not called the committee together and asked to be excused from serving as chairman, not having time to devote to the work. For this act Father Blanchet has been severely handled by partisan historians of Oregon. W. H. Gray in his so-called *History of Oregon*, is especially abusive. Chief Justice Burnett in his manuscript *Memoirs of an Old Pioneer* (in the Bancroft Library. This passage is not published in the book bearing the same title) defends Blanchet's action on the ground that he did not feel equal to the work which the committee had been set to do. It seems more probable, however, that Father Blanchet did not approve of the plan both because of its small chance of success and because of the attitude of its promoters towards the Hudson's Bay Co. The impracticable character of the proposed government may be learned from the fact that the committee accomplished no more under Blanchet's successor

than it had before. The project was opposed by Lieutenant Wilkes who was at Vancouver at this time in charge of the American exploring expedition on the Pacific.

Moreover, the animus of the promoters of the movement doomed it to failure. Opposition to the Hudson's Bay Co. was the ruling passion with the men who were projecting the new government. This was obvious to Father Blanchet and his relations with Dr. McLoughlin made it impossible for him to concur in the movement. The events in Oregon from 1840 to 1844 which laid the foundation of American ascendancy in this region were not political meetings or petitions to Congress reciting (falsely) the tyrannous exactions of the Hudson's Bay Co. American supremacy was established during this period by the annual influx of immigrants whose settlement in Oregon was made possible by the grand humanity of old Dr. McLoughlin, who extended over them his protecting hand, saving them from the savages and from famine, caring for their sick, furnishing them supplies of food and clothing and shelter for the winter and providing them with seed grain for the spring; and all this, let it be remembered, at his own loss, contrary to the express orders of his Company and in spite of the calumnies which the Americans already in the country were spreading concerning him.

On the occasion of the Third Annual Reunion of the Oregon Pioneer Association in 1876, the Annual Address was delivered by the Hon. Matthew P. Deady. In the course of his address, Judge Deady after very correctly observing that the Catholic missionaries were indifferent as to the ultimate possession of the country because they were not *settlers* but *ministers of the Gospel*, continued as follows: "They (Blanchet and Demers) were, however, subjects of Great Britain, and their influence and teaching among the people was naturally in favor of the authority and interest of the Hudson's Bay Company. They discouraged the early attempts at the formation of a settlers' government in the country." Archbishop Blanchet, in his *Historical Sketches* (1878) characterizes this statement as "a great mistake" and adds (p. 151), "All this is entirely in-

accurate; their being British subjects had nothing to do with their teaching, nor would it naturally lead them 'to teach their people in favor of the authority and interest of a fur-company.' A higher sense of feeling than this was their rule; they had a conscience and a faith. Nor did they ever discourage the early attempts of a settlers' government, either within or outside of their churches. When, during the meeting in June, 1841, Vicar General Blanchet gave his opinion that it was too soon (and), that as Commodore Wilkes was expected here, the committee should wait for his opinion,—that step was by no means an act of opposition, but on the contrary an act of prudence which the Commodore approved of at St. Paul on June 7th, on the ground that the country was too young. And also on a later occasion when he begged that his name be erased from those of the committee, that was done in no sense out of opposition but for want of time. In a word, let all comprehend that the two Catholic missionaries understood too well the delicacy of their position in this new and unsettled country, to commit such imprudent blunders." This emphatic declaration of the attitude of the Catholic missionaries must be taken as conclusive in view of the complete absence of evidence which would connect them with the opposition to the provisional government.

While these political developments were taking place a change in ecclesiastical administration was likewise being effected. The bishops of Quebec and Baltimore acting in concert (it will be recalled that the Oregon Country was in a state of joint occupancy, and ecclesiastical as well as civil limits were ill-defined), recommended to the Holy See to erect their joint mission into a Vicariate Apostolic. The suggestion was accepted and by a brief of December 1, 1843, the new Vicariate was created with Father Blanchet as its Vicar Apostolic with the title of Philadelphia *in partibus* (subsequently changed to that of Drusa to avoid confusion). The news of this action did not reach Oregon until November 4 of the following year. The bishop-elect decided to go to Canada for the purpose of receiving episcopal consecration. Appointing Father Demers

administrator, Father Blanchet crossed the Columbia bar December 5, 1844, on a ship bearing the name of the river. The voyage to Montreal was by a circuitous route. The ship visited Honolulu, doubled Cape Horn and arrived at Deal, England. Father Blanchet then went to Liverpool where he embarked for Boston. He reached Montreal towards the end of June after a tedious journey of more than six months. Here on the 25th of July, 1845, he received his consecration at the hands of the Right Rev. Ignatius Bourget, Bishop of Montreal.

A little more than six years had elapsed since Father Blanchet had established the Oregon Mission. Casting a retrospective glance over those years of missionary activity he writes in his *Historical Sketches*: "At the end of 1844, after six years of efforts disproportioned to the needs of the country, the vast mission of Oregon, on the eve of its being erected into a vicariate apostolic, had gained nearly all of the Indian tribes of the (Puget) Sound, Caledonia (British Columbia) and several tribes of the Rocky Mountains and of Lower Oregon. It had brought six thousand pagans to the faith. Nine missions had been founded: five in lower Oregon and four at the Rocky Mountains. Eleven churches and chapels had been erected, five in lower Oregon, two in Caledonia, and four at the Rocky Mountains. One thousand Canadians, women and children, had been saved from the imminent peril of losing their faith. . . . The Catholic Mission possessed two educational establishments, one for boys and the other for girls; the number of its missionaries had been raised to fifteen, without speaking of the treasure the mission had in the persons of the good *Religieuses* of Notre Dame de Namur." (p. 153.) We have in this brief record of the labors of our missionary priest an earnest of the apostolic work that was yet to be wrought by his consecrated hands. But of that work we shall speak in another paper.

SOURCES AND AUTHORITIES.

Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon, by Archbishop Blanchet ("Catholic Sentinel Press," Portland, Ore., 1878).
MS. *Letters of Archbishop Blanchet* (Archdiocesan Archives, Portland).

Mission de la Colombie, Lettre et Journal de J. B. Z. Bolduc (Quebec, 1844).

Monseigneur Provencher et les missions de la Rivière-Rouge, par l'Abbé G. Dugas (Montreal, 1889).

Manuscript Memoirs of Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet by Edmund Mallet (Unpublished), Library of St. Jean Baptiste Société, Woonsocket, R. I.

Memoirs of an Old Pioneer, by Peter Burnet (ms. Bancroft Library, University of California).

Transactions of the Oregon Pioneer Association (Portland, 1872 and following years).

The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society (Portland, 1900-10).

United States Catholic Historical Magazine (New York, 1887), Vol. I, No. 1.

The Life and Letters of Peter J. De Smet, S. J. (Chittenden and Richardson, 4 vols.)

Dr. John McLoughlin, by Mr. Frederick V. Holman (Cleveland, 1907).

History of the Catholic Church in America, by John G. Shea (New York, 1892, vol. IV).

Lives of Deceased Bishops of the United States, by Richard H. Clarke (vol. III, New York, 1888).

EDWIN V. O'HARA.

PORTLAND, OREGON.

SPECIMEN PAGES FROM THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS.

In a preceding article (*Cath. Univ. Bulletin*, April, 1909), an attempt was made to give a general view of the *Summa* of St. Thomas. The grand outlines of this great monument of human genius were pointed out in a hurried description; we did not pause to consider the many beautiful details of the grand structure. We passed along the street as it were and cast a glance of admiration at the grand cathedral which adorned it; we had no time to enter in order to see the beauty of the sacred edifice from within its hallowed walls. We beheld from afar the magnificent proportions of a gigantic structure; we did not approach in order to inspect more closely the everlasting work of the immortal builder. Coming face to face with the monument erected by a great genius we were filled with admiration and astonishment; recovering from those first impressions we now wish to gratify the laudable curiosity which prompts us to examine more closely the edifice which for more than six hundred years has excited the admiration of all who love the grand, the good, the beautiful and the true. However strongly we may covet the honor of being reputed a good *cicerone*, we find it necessary at the very beginning of this pilgrimage to the cathedral erected by St. Thomas, to make a declaration which is never made by the professional guide.

The cicerone's humble declaration:—I cannot promise to point out and explain every object of interest in the edifice. To appreciate the beauties of the *Summa* one must spend not only an hour or a day, but weeks and months, yes, years, in contemplating the grandeur of the general plan and the perfection of the details of this remarkable production of the great architect of theology. We must, of necessity, content ourselves with the selection of a few specimens of singular strength and beauty which will serve to give us an insight into the mind of

the architect. In other words—and here we lay aside the metaphor—it is our intention to give in this article some specimens of St. Thomas' doctrine and method, choosing from different parts of the *Summa* principles which will show that faith does not hamper reason, but that reason in a Christian philosopher, enlightened and guided by faith, may soar to the summit of intelligent research, good sense and sound judgment. The *Summa* represents the perfection of reason applied to the truths of faith in the manner in which it should be used, viz., as the servant of the higher truth which God deigned to reveal to men. For that very reason the Angelic Doctor is the greatest of Christian philosophers and the Prince of Theologians; he is the giant beside whom other philosophers and theologians appear as mere striplings, great and useful though they may be and are in their own sphere; thus it will be instructive as well as interesting to know something of his method in treating questions of philosophy and theology.

Difficulty of choosing specimens:—We are well aware that anyone attempting to give what might be called illustrations from the *Summa* must contend with two serious difficulties. First, he meets with what the French so aptly term “l’embarras du choix”; where there are so many excellencies it is difficult to choose one or a few as the objects of our special study and admiration. In the second place, St. Thomas' works were written in Latin, and in a style which was peculiarly his own; for lucidity, brevity and expressiveness nothing like it has ever been known. It is our firm conviction that all the great professors of Yale, Harvard, Oxford and Cambridge could never reproduce in English a page of St. Thomas which would do justice to the original. The mere mention of these two difficulties will be equivalent to a request that the reader kindly bear in mind, first, that the specimens given are only a few out of many that might have been chosen to illustrate St. Thomas' doctrine; secondly, that expositions of his doctrine given in English fall far short of the beauty, strength, accuracy and completeness of the Latin in which St. Thomas expressed, with the greatest ease and apparently without effort, the sublimest doctrines of theology.

Division of the Summa recalled:—Let us begin this investigation by recalling the grand division of the *Summa Theologica* in its three parts. The *first* treats of God—of God in Himself, one nature in three persons; of God as the Author and Ruler of the universe. The *second* treats of the tendency of the rational creature to God; in other words, of God as the end of man, and of human acts in general (1a 2ae) and in particular (2a 2ae). The *third* treats of Christ, who as man is the way by which we tend to God; in other words, of God as Redeemer, of the sacraments, and of the eternal life to which Christ conducts men. This division is recalled because we intend, in choosing specimens of St. Thomas' doctrine to follow the order of the *Summa*.

Principles of Pedagogy:—Yielding to an inclination which is entirely in accordance with the fitness of things, we shall select for the first specimen St. Thomas' principles on *teaching*—a most honorable and praiseworthy occupation in which many readers of the *Bulletin* are engaged during nine or ten months of the year. In his commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Thomas has sketched the character of an ideal Christian *Doctor*, of one who teaches the truths of religion. The perfect Doctor, he says, is one whose life as well as whose doctrine is light. Three things are necessary to him: *Stability*, that he may never deviate from the truth; *clearness*, that he may teach without obscurity; and *purity of intention* that he may seek God's glory and not his own. (In cap. v. *Matt.*) In the Prologue to the *Summa* and in several articles of the body of the work he lays down principles concerning teachers in general. The few words which he wrote by way of introduction to the *Summa*, giving his reasons for composing a manual of theology, are a mine of information concerning his principles on pedagogy, or the art of teaching the young.

Prologue to the Summa:—"We have considered that beginners in this sacred science find many impediments in those things which have been written by various authors; partly, on account of the multiplication of useless questions, articles and arguments; partly, because those things which are necessary

for the education of novices (*i. e.*, beginners) are not treated systematically, but as the exposition of certain books or the occasion of disputation demanded; and partly because the frequent repetitions beget confusion and disgust in the minds of learners."

Hints to teachers. Avoid useless questions:—Do not overload the mind of a beginner with a multitude of useless questions; choose those that are primary and fundamental; give the student a clear knowledge of them, bearing in mind the capacity of the pupil; establish them by a few good, strong arguments, if proofs are necessary, and then pass on to something more particular, without consuming valuable time in dealing with hair-splitting arguments which the beginner cannot understand, and in the study of which there is little profit and much annoyance. These remarks of St. Thomas were a quiet criticism of a scholasticism which was carried to excess, but they express a general rule which should be observed in all institutions of learning, from the highest university down to the lowest primary school. Neglect of this rule has often resulted in thrusting upon the community a class of so-called graduates, with a smattering of everything and a real knowledge of nothing—graduates who made our fathers sigh, sometimes not without reason, for the old-time school-houses and the days of "the three Rs."

Order:—In the next place, books for beginners should be written with due regard for scientific order, which is conducive to clearness of perception and helpful to the memory. The importance of this canon will be readily admitted by all who have ever attempted to "straighten out" the ideas of one who was not from the beginning of his education trained to think and study with order. Theology was a confused mass of dogmas, disputes and objections until St. Thomas introduced order into the chaos. As it was with theology so has it been, so shall it be, with other branches of knowledge, if due attention is not given to the scientific distribution of the subjects treated. By paying attention to this rule St. Thomas made it possible to take in at one glance the whole field of Catholic Theology.

Avoid repetitions.—Thirdly, avoid repetitions which, if they be frequent and unnecessary, excite disgust and cause confusion. For those who are very young it is necessary to repeat the same thing frequently in order that it may be indelibly impressed on their minds; but there is a limit to this necessity. Many a boy has left school in disgust because he was not allowed to advance, but was held back, waiting perhaps for dull or lazy class-mates, and had to listen for weeks or months to the same old story. But, we must not enter into the details of school or college life; we merely wished to call attention to a principle which guided St. Thomas when he wrote the *Summa*. The three rules which have been mentioned he followed to the letter, writing “with brevity and clearness” on those things which pertain to sacred doctrine, and that is one of the reasons why his *Summa* is still regarded as the model manual of theology. The advanced student can find in it material for deep and mature thought, and beginners who have read its pages are unanimous in declaring that it is the most satisfactory and the clearest of all theologies.

Teaching and learning.—In the first article, 117th question of the first part, St. Thomas asks the question: Can one man teach another? After rejecting the theories of Averroes and of Plato—opinions which were founded on their false systems with regard to the union of soul and body—the Angelic Doctor gives his own answer to the question. One man can teach another, and the teacher can be truly said to impart knowledge to the mind of the pupil by causing him actually to know that which before he had only the capacity to know. Of the effects produced by an external agent, some are caused by an external agent alone, some are caused by an external agent and also by a cause operating from within. Thus a house contributes nothing to its own erection; the work is all done by an external agent, the builder. But health is caused in a sick person sometimes by the medicine which he takes and sometimes by the recuperative powers of nature itself. When two causes coöperate in the production of such effects it must be remembered that the principal cause is

not the external agent, but the internal one; the external agent is the assistant, furnishing means and aid which the internal agent makes use of to produce the desired effect. The physician does not produce health; health is produced by nature aided by the physician and his remedies.

This is what takes place when one man teaches another. Knowledge in the pupil must result from the activity of his own mind. Sometimes, without the aid of a teacher, he can acquire knowledge by his own exertions, applying the native force of his mind by which he naturally knows the first principles of all knowledge. Sometimes he is taught by another, but even then the mind of the pupil is the principal cause, the teacher is only the assistant, stating universal propositions from which others follow, or giving examples and similitudes which readily bring to the mind things of which the pupil had not thought, or showing the connection between principles and conclusions which the pupil would not have noticed if the master had not called his attention to them.

This, according to St. Thomas, is how a master causes a pupil to know things. It is not like the process of pouring water into a vessel. He is not simply the receiver of good things from without; he is a living agent, and all the teachers in the world can do him no good unless they adopt methods which will stimulate the activity of his mind. No one can know for another, each one must know for himself; teachers are only intended to excite the latent energies of our minds and to help us in knowing. It is not well to make things too easy for learners; if the mind of the pupil is not called upon to digest and assimilate the food administered by the teacher, the knowledge communicated, often with great pains on the part of the teacher, will be—to use a common expression—like water poured into a sieve. If you wish to know a good teacher, and if you wish to know a well written book intended to stimulate healthful activity in the minds of students, read the *Summa* of St. Thomas.

St. Thomas and the necessity of revelation.:—From the prologue let us pass to the first article of the *Summa*, where St.

Thomas treats of the necessity of revelation for the knowledge of natural truths. Because all men by the light of reason can know some things, Rationalists and infidels say that men can know all things without the aid of revelation. Catholic theologians were not slow to answer that men, as they have been and as they are, cannot without revelation have a perfect knowledge even of those truths which come within the scope of their natural capacity for knowing. In their zeal for the defence of God's teaching some theologians went so far as to assert that without the aid of revelation, which has been handed down by tradition in the human family men cannot have a certain and perfect knowledge of any supersensible truth. This was an exaggeration, and Traditionalism has been condemned by the Vicar of Christ on earth. (Greg. XVI, Sept. 8, 1840. See Denzinger, *Enchir.*, n. 1622.)

St. Thomas pointed out the medium between Rationalism and Traditionalism. In the 88th question of the first part of the *Summa* he proves that man can know supersensible and immaterial things, and even God himself. But that knowledge would not suffice for the human race in its present condition in order that all might have a perfect knowledge of natural truths, especially of truths that pertain to God. The reader's attention may here be called to the fact that the Fathers of the Vatican Council in defining the necessity of revelation, used almost the same words employed by St. Thomas in the first article of the *Summa Theologica*, and in the fourth chapter, first book, of the *Summa Contra Gentes*. The Vatican Council says that the revelation of natural truths is necessary in order that they may be known "by all men, without delay, with certitude and without admixture of error." St. Thomas had written in the *Summa Theologica*: without revelation these truths could be known "only by a few, after a long time, and with the admixture of many errors." These words are a repetition of what he wrote in the *Summa Contra Gentes*, where he says that God in his goodness proposed those natural truths to be believed by men that thus "all might easily have the knowledge of God without doubt and without error." Now, how does he prove his thesis? Without revelation the truths of natural religion

would have been known only by a few for three reasons: first, some men are unfit for study: hence they could never attain to the summit of knowledge which consists in knowing God. Again, some are too much occupied with temporal affairs; hence they would not have the time to acquire the knowledge of the sublimest truths. Lastly, some men are lazy, and although God has implanted in them a natural desire to know Him, they would never undergo the labor which is the price that must be paid for the knowledge of metaphysical truths.

Even those few would acquire this knowledge only after a long time, because (a) the truths of which we are speaking are profound truths, and (b) a long preparation is necessary before men can understand them, and (c) whilst men are young the passions prevent the attentive consideration of sublime truths. But even after long preparation and study those few would still be in doubt and be subject to error. We are all liable to err. Knowing this and knowing that the greatest philosophers dispute about important questions, and often mix in with the truth things that are false or doubtful or only half proved, where are we to find amongst men that freedom from error and doubt without which our knowledge even of natural truths will be very imperfect and unsatisfactory? Consequently, revelation is necessary in order that those truths may be known by all, without delay, with certainty and without error. Comments would destroy the beauty and the force of those words, I simply ask: Where can we find anything to equal the conciseness and the completeness of that article?

Ontologism and Kantism.—St. Thomas is scarcely less admirable in his refutation of Ontologism. This name has been given to a system which teaches that the first idea formed in the human mind is a direct knowledge of God. Without that idea we can have no scientific knowledge; with that idea we can have a certain and infallible knowledge of all things. We do not see the essence of God as he is in Himself, but we see that essence as it represents all things, which were first conceived in the mind of God and were then created in accordance with the idea of the Divine Architect of the world.

This system was taught by Malebranche in the 17th century, and afterwards, with various modifications unnecessary to explain, by Gioberti and others, notably in our own times by Profesor Ubaghs, a great light of the University of Louvain.

It cannot be denied that if the propositions of the Ontologists could be admitted we should have a ready answer to the objections made by sceptics against the scientific value of metaphysical knowledge. We have knowledge, it could be answered, of truths that are universal, immutable, necessary and eternal, because we see them in the eternal and immutable Author of all things and all truth. Kant and his disciples could no longer claim that our metaphysical knowledge is destitute of a scientific basis. Although the senses do not manifest the eternal, necessary and immutable truth of first principles, *e. g.* of the principle of contradiction; a thing cannot be and not be at the same time, or the whole is greater than its part, nevertheless we see these truths in God when He is seen by our minds. Such a defence of metaphysics, however is based upon an exaggeration of the truth, and Ontologism was condemned by a decree of the Inquisition dated Sept. 18th, 1861. Verily there is nothing new under the sun. St. Thomas had refuted Ontologism six hundred years before the date of the decree. In the 11th article, question 12 of the first part of the *Summa* he proves that no one can see the essence of God in this life; this vision is reserved for the blessed who always see Him face to face. In the 5th article, question 84 of the same part he shows that there is no necessity of saying that we see all things *in God* as in a mirror; because we have our intellects, which are rays emanating from the Divine Light, distinct from God and caused by Him. What the intellect manifests is truth, and we know it to be the truth because of the evidence and light which accompany the manifestation in our minds (*vide* 1 P., qq. 16 and 17). We know the truths: two and two make four; the whole is greater than its part; there is no effect without a cause, etc., because we see them. There is no more necessity of proving these truths than there is of proving the reality of the stone or brick falling

on one's head. If you analyse and apply those principles, they will reveal the Source of all truth, as rays make known the sun from which they emanate, but they are not God, they are participations of the eternal Truth which enlightens all men. St. Thomas goes farther, and in the 2a 2ae, question 173, first article, he anticipates an answer which the Ontologists might make, and explodes the distinction on which it is based. In the time of St. Thomas some writers thought to explain the gift of prophecy by saying that prophets see God to whom the past, present and future are one. When they were asked, as we ask the Ontologists: In what then do they differ from the blessed in heaven? the answer was: They see God not as He is in Himself, but in as much as He contains representations of future events. Worthless distinction, says St. Thomas. You cannot see things as they are represented in the essence of God without seeing the essence of God. The representations or ideas of things (*rationes rerum*) in God are the essence of God as it represents things, past, present or future. If God were composed of parts we might see one part without seeing the other, but whoever is looking directly at a thing that is simple sees either all of it or nothing. The participations of the one great Truth are manifold; hence we can see one without seeing the other or without seeing the source; but whoever sees these truths in the essence sees also the source, unless words have lost all meaning. Outside of these principles, which St. Thomas proposed as calmly as if he were writing the first page of an A B C book, there is no solid refutation of many of the high-sounding *isms* which make life burdensome to students of philosophy in our days.

St. Thomas and interpretation of Scripture:—Another manifestation of St. Thomas' good judgment is to be found in those passages where he lays down rules for the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures. These rules are explained at some length in the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on the study of the Scriptures, and a glance at the document will show that they are taken in great part from the writings of St. Thomas. In the course of the document the learned Pontiff frequently

refers to his favorite theologian by the use of such expressions as, "St. Thomas being our guide"—"St. Thomas here holds the first place"—"St. Thomas teaches"—"This course was pursued by that great theologian Thomas Aquinas," etc. In thus quoting and following St. Thomas the Pope does not neglect other guides and other rules; they are, as it were, embodied in St. Thomas, because he may be regarded as the personification of the wisdom of preceding times, being in a special manner filled with reverence for the authority of the Church and for the writings of the Fathers, the two tribunals to which disputes on the Scriptures must be referred. It is not to be expected that we should make a complete list of the rules laid down by St. Thomas for the study of the Scriptures, but we take pleasure in calling attention to a few principles which he proposed for the guidance of interpreters in cases of difficulty and doubt. The importance of these principles is very strongly urged in the Pope's Encyclical, and although they are very plain and simple, it must be confessed that they have not always been observed by those who should have applied them. Attacks made at different times by so-called scientists against the first chapter of Genesis have called forth many able books in defence of the revealed truth, but the defenders did not always observe that moderation and calmness which would have ensured uniformity of method in the defence, and which would have precluded the necessity of changing with the variations of science. St. Thomas treated those very questions and found it necessary to discuss many theories offered in explanation of the words of Genesis. He was not in the least disturbed by any of them and would not have been disturbed if the systems proposed had been twenty times as numerous as they were, because he was always guided by a good rule found in St. Augustine, based upon strong faith and good common sense. In such questions, he wrote, (1 P., q. 68, art. 1), two things are to be borne in mind: first, that the Scriptures teach nothing but the truth. Secondly, since passages of Scripture can sometimes be explained in different ways, let no one hold one explanation so tenaciously that he would not

be prepared to give it up if a better explanation were offered. The first part of this rule—about the truth of the Scriptures—had it been known and observed, would have prevented many cases of scriptural heart disease which at times afflicted certain timorous believers who foolishly became excited by reason of the discovery of some scientist. Let scientific men continue their investigations and excavations. When they are prepared to tell us just what science teaches, not what so-called scientists say, then we shall be prepared to meet them and to revise, if necessary, not the Scriptures—because there can be no opposition between true science and the words of the Holy Ghost—but our interpretations of Scripture. Necessity for such revisions will not be very frequent, because it has happened and will happen again, that what was flashed over the wires as a new discovery of science was simply the hastily concocted theory of some unbeliever, who was over-anxious to prove that there was no God and no hell. There may be apparent contradictions between science and Genesis; but the Catholic Church is to last until the end of time, and she can wait until science has determined what is certain before deciding what interpretations of Genesis are to be abandoned.

The second part of St. Thomas' rule—about various interpretations—had it been known and observed, would have prevented two grave evils: first, the disappointment and vexation of those who see their pet theories overturned; secondly, the scoffing of unbelievers, when they see theologians offering first one explanation and then another in defending the faith. St. Thomas lays down as a general rule that the defence of faith should not be based upon the reasons or theories advanced by different schools of theology. To outsiders what the Church teaches and what a theologian of the Church teaches are one and the same thing; and if they overthrow the theologian they think they have overthrown the faith and the Church. We who are of the faith know that theologians may make mistakes, whilst the Holy Ghost cannot teach error; even St. Thomas might fall, but the Church built upon the rock shall stand forever. St. Thomas, true to his

principles, allowed the greatest latitude in interpreting the first chapter of Genesis, and any other part of Scripture, when the sense of the words had not been determined by the authority of the Church. He favors the system which says that the days of creation are to be taken in the ordinary sense of the words, but he proposes his theory simply as an opinion, and does not reject the system of St. Augustine, who said that by the morning was meant the knowledge of things which the Angels have in the Word, *i. e.*, in the beatific vision, and by the evening the knowledge of things which the Angels have outside of the Word, *i. e.*, through infused ideas. He also mentions various theories about the light, the firmament, the condition of plants, trees and animals, when they were created, etc., but he had too much foresight and theological balance to tie himself down to any one theory; and thus the truth of the Scriptures remained intact whilst men and their theories appeared for a while on the scene and then passed away.

The specimens of St. Thomas' doctrine thus far given were taken from the first part of the *Summa*. We must now pass on to inspect other parts of his great work.

In the first place it may be remarked in a general way that in the 1a 2ae and 2a 2ae of St. Thomas there is more genuine moral theology, as a scientific knowledge of men and of their acts, than can be found in the hundreds of manuals or compendiums which have been written since the sixteenth century, and which can claim little merit except in so far as they apply to ever changing times and circumstances the principles proposed by St. Thomas or by other great scholastics.

Human acts, virtues and vices, original sin, law, grace:—His explanation of human acts and of those things which affect human acts; his definition and classification of the virtues and vices; his most sensible and most satisfactory explanation of original sin; the depth and accuracy of his treatise on laws; the sublimity and acumen of his tract on grace, have made the *prima secundae* the source and fountain-head from which flow the principles that should guide all those who wish to point out the true doctrine on the tendency of the rational creature to God.

Best form of government:—In the 1a 2ae, question 105, article first, we find St. Thomas' opinion on the best form of government. If we consider merely the words he used it would be said that he pronounces in favor of a limited monarchy; but if we go below the words and consider the principles on which his conclusion is based, it will appear that the Angelic Doctor was not averse to a republic, and I believe that if he were living today he would be an ardent supporter of our form of government. "One of the principal things to be considered," he wrote, "with regard to the good establishment of princes (rulers) is that all *should have some part in the government*; for in this way peace is preserved amongst the people, and all are pleased with such a disposition of things and maintain it. The next thing to be considered is the form of government, of which there are principally two kinds: a Kingdom, in which one rules, and an Aristocracy, in which a few exercise the authority. The best form is that in which one rules over all, and under him there are others having authority, but the government pertains to all, because those who exercise authority can be chosen from all and are chosen by all Hence the best government is a mixture of a Kingdom, of Aristocracy and of Democracy, *i. e., of the power of the people*, in as much as the rulers can be chosen from the people, and the election of the rulers belongs to the people." There is a vast amount of good republicanism and of sound democracy in these words. First, by the king or monarch St. Thomas means nothing more than some *one* who is to represent the governing authority—who is to be, as we would say, the executive authority. Secondly, the *aristocracy* means those who exercise a salutary restraint on the power of the head of the government; because if there were no restraint the power of the king, says St. Thomas (ad 2um), would easily degenerate into tyranny. Congressmen and Senators for instance, would supply the demand for an aristocracy. Lastly, St. Thomas says that neither a kingdom nor an aristocracy will form a stable government unless the element of democracy is introduced by permitting the choice of the rulers from the

people and by the people, that thus all may have some part in the government. These words lead us to believe that if St. Thomas were living today he would be a republican or a democrat.

Infallibility of the Pope:—In the *secunda secundae*, question 1, article 10, on Faith, St. Thomas teaches the infallibility of the Pope, “to whose authority it pertains to determine finally the things that are of faith, that they may be held by all with unwavering assent.” Hence, he adds, it has been the custom of the Church to refer to the Pope all the grave and difficult questions which arise; and our Lord said to St. Peter whom He appointed supreme Pontiff: “I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren” (*Luke* xxii, 32). He then gives the following theological reason for his conclusion: “There should be one faith in the Church, according to the words of St. Paul (1 *Cor.* 1, 10): ‘That you all speak the same things, and that there be no schisms among you.’ This will not be possible unless questions of faith that arise can be determined by the one who presides over the whole Church, so that his determination should be held by the whole Church.” Three hundred years before Protestantism was known, and six hundred years before the Vatican Council was celebrated, St. Thomas proclaimed and proved Papal Infallibility.

Infidels not to be urged to believe:—In the tenth question, 7th article of the same treatise, St. Thomas teaches that unbelievers cannot be compelled to accept the Christian faith; because to believe is an act of the will and the will cannot be forced. Those who have accepted the faith can be punished if they fail to keep the promises which they made; unbelievers can lawfully be prevented from persecuting Christians, from blaspheming Christianity, or from carrying on a wicked proselytism; hence Christian nations have at times waged war against infidels. But, even when unbelievers have been conquered and captured they must be left free to believe or not to believe.

These things do not surprise us, being so reasonable, so natural and so well known. There are, however, in the world today—some of them are in our own country—men, who need the consoling assurance that the greatest of medieval theologians would not approve of a papal invasion for the purpose of compelling outsiders to accept the Roman Catholic faith.

Children of Jews and infidels:—St. Thomas will not allow the children of Jews or other unbelievers to be baptised without the consent of their parents (2a 2ae, q. x, art. 12; 3 P., q. 68, art. 10). According to the natural law, a child, before he arrives at the use of reason, is under the care of his father (*i. e.*, of his parents); hence it would be against natural justice if a child, before it acquires the use of reason, were withdrawn from the care of its parents, or if anything were done with it against the wish of the parents.

The Incarnation:—In the third part of the *Summa*, St. Thomas treats of the Incarnation, of the sacraments instituted by Christ, and of eternal life. We read in the life of St. Thomas that on three different occasions Christ spoke to his servant, saying: “Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma—Thou hast written well of me, Thomas.” This approbation of our Lord should be understood as applying in a special manner to the third part of the *Summa*. It is impossible to find anything more scientific and more sublime than St. Thomas’ treatise on the Incarnation. Starting out with the Scriptures in his hand, and with this one truth accepted on faith: Jesus was both God and man, he constructs a most remarkable treatise on the natures and person of Christ, on the acts and sufferings of God incarnate. The tract contains fifty-nine questions, with an average of five or six articles to a question. The Old and New Testaments, the councils, the decrees of the Popes, the writings of the Fathers, are all called upon to glorify Jesus Christ, the corner-stone on which our faith is built. The treatise is a most extraordinary combination of deep faith and piety, of theological learning and good sense. What we know from good authority St. Thomas affirms with certainty, and no theologian can equal him when there is question of determining the con-

clusions which can be drawn from the truths made known by faith. On questions that depend on the will of God alone, if that will has not been made known to us, he wisely abstains from useless speculations. In this he differs from writers of less renown who seem to be afraid of saying: There are some things which we do not know and cannot know until God speaks on the subject.

Baptism:—He applies the same rule in his treatise on the sacraments. In his treatise, for instance, on the necessity of Baptism he first calls attention to the law of salvation laid down by our Saviour himself: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (*John* III, 5). After that, when the question arises: What, then, is to become of children who die without having an opportunity to receive baptism? St. Thomas answers: As far as we know, men can do nothing for them; they are in the hands of God, who is all powerful and just (3 P., q. 68, art. 11 ad 1^m). Men may write for weeks and months; they may fill the pages of reviews and may publish books on this subject, but, since God has not deigned to make any special revelation concerning these children, they can give us no more satisfaction than that which is afforded by St. Thomas' short declaration: Those children are in the hands of God; He will deal with them in justice and in mercy.

The Eucharist:—His treatise on the Eucharist is one that would not disappoint those who expect something grand from the author of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament. For St. Thomas the Eucharist, as a sacrament and as a sacrifice, was truly the centre of the Christian religion. Towards our Lord under the sacramental species he had a profound devotion and a tender piety; hence he threw his whole soul into his tract on this sacrament of love. The bread of the angels made the Angelic Doctor more angelic; the extraordinary perspicacity of his penetrating mind is nowhere more strikingly manifested than in the articles of this treatise where he developes the conclusions which flow from the dogmas of the Real Presence and of Transubstantiation, or where he answers the objections

which had been made or could be made against this important doctrine of the Catholic Church. Christ, in his sacred person and in the Eucharist, was the central object of St. Thomas' life and the centre towards which all his theological treatises were directed.

For other specimens of St. Thomas' doctrine the reader is referred to that golden book, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which was taken almost bodily from the *Summa Theologica*, and was composed by three men who had spent their lives studying the works of the Angelic Doctor. Cardinal Newman was in love with this book, and always spoke of it in terms of the highest praise.

St. Thomas and the Encyclicals of Leo XIII:—We would also recommend most earnestly to those who wish to know St. Thomas, the study of the dogmatic Encyclicals of the late Pope Leo XIII. Knowing the Pope to be an enthusiastic admirer of the Angelic Doctor our readers will not be surprised to learn that his dogmatic Encyclicals are to a great extent nothing more than developments of principles laid down by St. Thomas. This is in a special manner true of the Encyclicals on Scholastic Philosophy, The Christian Constitution of States, The Condition of Workingmen, The Study of the Scriptures, and Devotion to the Holy Ghost. The Holy Father believed firmly that the principles of the Angelic Doctor would bring light and order into the darkness and confusion of the nineteenth century as they did in the thirteenth century. We should feel very happy and fully repaid for the time spent on this paper if we could think that it might be the means of exciting a desire to know and to follow the words of advice addressed to the children of this troubled age, by the wise, learned and saintly Pope Leo XIII.

D. J. KENNEDY, O. P.

THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF SAINT CYPRIAN.

[Continued.]

VII. SEAT OF SUPREME AUTHORITY.

In a previous article⁴³ we reviewed St. Cyprian's notion of the constitution of the Church of Christ—how its fundamental characteristic was Catholic Unity: how the unity was maintained in each local church by a monarchical bishop, and in the whole church by a harmonious episcopate; how the bishop of the local church, while enjoying a large share of independence in the management of the affairs of his diocese, had nevertheless to recognize some superior ecclesiastical authority to which he had to bow his head in submission and the canons of which he had to observe under pain of sacrificing his membership of the fold of Christ. Our next step is to inquire who are the subjects or subject, as the case may be, of this Catholic authority? From the evidence brought forward there seems to be an ascending scale of jurisdiction. The bishop ruled his church, and a group of churches collected into a province was legislated for by a council of bishops of that region. From which it is reasonable to infer that a body composed of all the bishops of Christendom could formulate decrees binding on the whole Church. This much must be understood by Cyprian since he taught that the Church is founded on the bishops and together they form but one indivisible episcopate—a “college of priests” which succeeds the college of the apostles and like it governs the Church by the unanimous consent of its members. This is the sense of the words of his epistle to Stephen about Marcian. “The brethren at Arles are in need and entreat our succor. For, for that reason the body of priests is abundantly large, joined together by the bond of mutual concord and the link of unity; so that if any one of

⁴³ *Catholic University Bulletin*, October, 1910.

our college should try to originate heresy, and to lacerate and lay waste Christ's flock, others may help and as it were, as useful and merciful shepherds gather together the Lord's sheep into the flock." ⁴⁴ Besides, since some universal authority exists in the Church it can be found no where else than among the body of bishops who are the governors of the Church. But the still further question arises, and this brings our essay to a head, whether the subject of the supreme authority and universal jurisdiction of the Catholic Church may not be more restricted, whether, in fact, we may not find evidence in Cyprian to prove that it resides in one individual, and that the bishop of Rome. In other words did Cyprian know and believe in the Catholic Doctrine that Christ left to St. Peter and his successors a primacy of power in the Church and did he recognize that primacy as existing in the Church and bishop of Rome?

In Chapter four of his work, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, Cyprian sets forth briefly his notion of the constitution of the Church. This chapter has long been the subject of a dispute into which we cannot afford to enter here. Suffice it to say that of two alternate readings one was much more favorable to the Roman claim than the other, and Catholics were accused of forging this in the 15th or 16th century. It is now proved beyond all doubt by the able and diligent scholar Dom Chapman ⁴⁵ that the reading can be traced back to the 4th or 5th century, that is to a time prior to any record we possess of the so-called genuine text. The only rational theory Dom Chapman, followed by Pere Battifol ⁴⁶ and sustained by Professor Harnack, can suggest is that both readings came from the hand of Cyprian himself—the one directed against the schismatics at Carthage and of such a nature as would argue for and suit the unity in any See throughout the Church, where the bishops succeed to the apostles by vicarious ordination, whereas the other is adapted to the peculiar position of the Roman See, where ruled the Prince of the Apostles and where the Nova-

⁴⁴ Ep. 66.

⁴⁵ *Revue bénédictine* (1902), xix, 246.

⁴⁶ For full discussion see Battifol's *L'église naissante et le catholicisme*, p. 440.

tions sought to divide the unity of the Chair of Peter. This theory is sustained by Cyprian's letters⁴⁷ and the specifically Cyprianic style of both texts, so that the more advanced has nothing which is not found in other parts of the author's writings. We here quote the edition which combines both readings, for while it in no way changes their sense its form suits our present purpose best. Cyprian wishing to recall those who were led away by the schismatics from their allegiance to their bishops, sets before them the unity of the Church and the need of standing true to the one legitimate ruler of each church. "If any one will consider these things," he says, "there's no need of lengthened proof and arguments. There is easy proof for faith in a short summary of the truth. The Lord says to St. Peter, 'I say to thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it and to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven.' And to him again, after His resurrection, He says, 'Feed my sheep.' Upon him being one He builds His Church, and to him commends the sheep to be fed. And although to all the Apostles after His resurrection He gives an equal power, and says, 'As the Father sent Me, even so send I you, receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye shall forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained'; yet in order to maintain unity, He constituted one chair, and by His own authority disposed the origin of that authority as beginning from one. Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endowed with an equal fellowship both of honor and power, but the beginning proceeds from unity, and the primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one, and the chair as one. And they all are shepherds, and the flock is shown to be one, such as to be fed by all the Apostles with unanimous agreement, that the Church

⁴⁷Ep. 50⁴.

of Christ may be manifested as one. . . . He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He who strives against and resists the Church, who deserts the Chair of Peter upon whom the Church was founded, does he feel confident that he is in the Church?" These passages leave little doubt but that Peter was made the Supreme Head of the Church, for is he not the rock foundation of the Church, the pastor to whose care has been entrusted the whole flock, the one apostle who received the primacy among his equals in all other respects, and is not his the one primatial Chair, after which has been modelled the other chairs, or sees? We need but quote the comment of Dom Chapman on this text in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*. "Protestant controversialists," he says, "have attributed to St. Cyprian the absurd argument, that Christ said to Peter what he really meant for all, in order to give a type or picture of unity. What St. Cyprian really said is simply this, that Christ, using the metaphor of an edifice, founds His Church on a single foundation which shall manifest and ensure its unity. And as Peter is the foundation binding the whole Church together, so in each diocese is the bishop. Whoever is not with the bishop is cut off from the unity of the Church, and so cannot be with Christ. By this argument Cyprian claims to cut at the root of all heresies and schisms."⁴⁸ This writer thinks it a mistake to find a reference to Rome in this passage. But what means Cyprian by telling the Roman Confessors that in deserting the chair of Peter they cut themselves off from the unity of the Church, unless he took for granted that the See of Rome was that same chair of Peter, the centre of Catholic unity, and the foundation of the Church, just as the other chairs or sees were the successors of the other Apostles, and to be cut off from them was equally to be deprived of Church communion? Throughout the epistles of Cyprian we find many passages parallel to the above, and again and again is repeated the idea of the Church founded on Peter, who is the origin and source of Christian unity. Evidently Peter must live on

⁴⁸ Art. on 'Cyprian.'

in his successors as the guardian and support of that same unity. For instance to Jubaiarius he writes:—⁴⁹ “But it is manifest where and by whom the remission of sins can be given, to wit, that which is given in baptism. For first of all the Lord gave the power to Peter upon whom He built the Church and whence He *appointed and showed the source of unity—the power*, namely, that whatsoever he loosed on earth should be loosed also in heaven. And after the resurrection also He speaks to the Apostles and says, ‘as the Father hath sent Me, so send I you, &c.’. . . whence we perceive that they only who are set over the Church and established in the Gospel law, and in the ordinance of the Lord are allowed to baptize and give remission of sins.” While again,⁵⁰ “the Church founded by Christ upon Peter for a source and principle of unity is one.” In another place he says that Peter in answering Christ, “Lord, to whom shall we go,” “*speaks with the voice of the Church.*”⁵¹ These with numerous similar expressions make it plain that Cyprian attributed to Peter a headship and primacy, in the strict sense, over the Church, and so by implication he must grant the like position to Peter’s successors in the See of Rome, for he freely allows that the bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter, and that Peter’s Chair is at Rome. For the Church as long as it exists and remains one, requires *one foundation* to sustain its structure and to guard its unity; and the basis of all Cyprian’s arguments against the schismatics is that these are as much living realities to-day as in the day when Peter himself ruled over the college of Apostles. But we do not intend to trust to inference for our proof that Cyprian believed that the See of Rome possessed the primacy of power in the Church. We shall now bring forward direct evidence to show that Cyprian believed that the Church and Bishop of Rome enjoyed in his day an authority over the whole Church. But we must not expect to find in the pages of Cyprian or of any other contemporary writer such clear and definite concepts of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy as we now possess. For all dogmas of the Church

⁴⁹ Ep. 72^l.⁵⁰ Ep. 69^s.⁵¹ Ep. 54^l.

took time to develop, and many doctrines which to us are absolutely plain and clearly taught in the Scriptures were to the early centuries not so evident at all. They had vague, confused notions about many things and clear cut ideas about few. Hence all we can hope for in regard to any doctrine is to find the current of feeling and opinion, rather manifested in practice than theory, flowing in the right direction. And if Cyprian, with so many other bishops, was at sea in regard to the conditions for valid baptism, and seemingly quite ignorant of papal infallibility, and certainly erroneous in many other points, we shall be grateful to discover in the records he has left us such testimony as can reasonably lead one to no other conclusion than that he was aware of and believed in the supreme authority of the Church of Rome, and the primatial jurisdiction of its bishop.

VIII. THE ROMAN PRIMACY.

The first indication of Rome's control over the other churches is contained in a letter written at the beginning of the Decian persecution from the Roman Clergy to the Clergy at Carthage. The former, who, in the vacancy that occurred between the death of Fabian and the election of Cornelius, held the reins of power, having heard of the retirement of Cyprian and ignorant of the circumstances of his flight, wrote a strong letter of censure on him to the Carthaginian Clergy. We just give one quotation which indicates Rome's consciousness of her duty to watch over and direct the *whole body of the faithful*.⁵² "Since it devolves upon us," they say, "who appear to be placed on high, in the place of the Shepherd, to keep watch over the flock, if we be found neglectful it will be said of us that we have not sought for that which is lost." And this, mind, was spoken in reference to the Church of Carthage. The whole epistle betrays a tone of authority, and ends by exhorting the African Clergy to stand firm and

⁵² Ep. 2.

not to be found hirelings. Cyprian does not repudiate this letter as an unwarrantable assumption of authority and an encroachment on his rights as pastor. On the contrary in a subsequent letter we merely find him justifying his retirement, and he forwards to Rome the letters written during his absence to his church as proof that he did not desert his flock. He further informs the Roman Clergy that he stood by *their judgment* in his treatment of the lapsed "lest our proceedings which ought to be united and to agree in all things, should in any respect be different." After which he intimates his intention to hold a council at which he hopes to have the advantage of their advice.⁵³

If we combine two other letters⁵⁴—one from Cyprian to the Roman Clergy and their reply—they throw further light on Rome's far-reaching care. "Both our common love and the reason of the thing," says the Bishop of Carthage, "demand that I should keep back from your knowledge nothing of those matters that are transacted among us, that so we may have a common plan for the advantage of the administration of the Church;" and of the disobedient lapsed he says, "if their temerity should not be repressed either by my letters or *by yours*. . . . I shall take such steps as the Lord in His Gospel has enjoined." The reply has this significant paragraph, "In respect of Privatus of Lambesa you have acted *as you usually do* in desiring to inform us of the matter, as being an object of anxiety, for it becomes us all to watch for the body of the whole Church, whose members are scattered through every various province." To which is added the still more telling fact that when Privatus was deposed by an African council and Pope Fabian, he sought letters of restoration from Rome, but was refused. What stronger proof could we have of Rome's universal power, if she could restore the bishop of far-off Lambesa to his see?

Another notable fact is the universal interest taken in the election of the bishop of Rome. We are told that Cornelius was made bishop, by the "testimony of his fellow bishops, the

⁵³ Ep. 14³.

⁵⁴ Ep. 28 and 29⁴.

whole number of whom has agreed with an absolute unanimity *throughout the whole world.*"⁵⁵ In connection with this I may introduce the words of Chapman.⁵⁶ "The confusion created through the whole Church by the Novation Schism shows us clearly the enormous importance of the papacy in East and West. St. Dionysius, of Alexandria, joined his great influence to that of the Carthaginian primate, and he was very soon able to write that Antioch, Caesarea, Jerusalem, Tyre and Laodicea, all Cilicia and Cappadocia, Syria and Arabia, Mesopotamia, Pontus and Bithynia, had returned to union and that their bishops were all in concord with Cornelius."⁵⁷ From this one can guess the area of disturbance. Cyprian says that Novation 'assumed the primacy'⁵⁸ and sent out his new apostles to very many cities, and where in all provinces and cities there were long established and orthodox bishops, tried in persecution, he dared to create new ones to supplant them, as though he could range through the whole world."⁵⁹ As we have already seen, for the appointment of bishop the custom was that the bishops *of the province* should assemble, but we find even African bishops present at the election of Cornelius;⁶⁰ while another curious thing is that on the elevation to the episcopate of the bishop of Rome, Cyprian directs letters to him "according to the requirements alike of the sanctity and the truth of divine tradition and ecclesiastical institution,"⁶¹ and he got the other African bishops to do likewise. Which expression leads one to believe that it was the duty of every bishop in the Church to acknowledge the elected bishop of Rome, which must be peculiar to the Roman See, and explicable only on the hypothesis that she was mistress of them all, and by this procedure they acknowledged her primacy. Cyprian informs Cornelius in striking terms why he ordered his fellow bishops to recognize him as the legitimate bishop of Rome, "that so," he says, "the whole of our colleagues might decidedly approve of and maintain *both you*

⁵⁵ Ep. 51^a.⁵⁶ Ep. 75^a.⁶¹ Ep. 40-41.⁵⁶ *Catholic Ency.*—Cyprian.⁵⁸ Ep. 51^a.⁵⁷ *Euseb.*, vii, 5.⁶⁰ Ep. 51^a.

*and your communion, that is, as well the unity of the Catholic Church as its charity,"*⁶² where he identifies communion with the Bishop of Rome as identical with the union with the Catholic Church. Here is how he speaks of the appointment of Novation as Anti-Pope!⁶³ "The adverse party has not only rejected *the bosom and embrace of its root and Mother*, but even with a worse discord has appointed a bishop for itself, and contrary to the sacrament once delivered of the divine appointment and of Catholic Unity has made an adulterous and opposed head outside the Church." The words emphasized are important as in another place he calls Rome the "root and womb of the Catholic Church."⁶⁴ What can these expressions applied to Rome mean other than what is understood by naming St. Peter the foundation of the Church and the source and principle of Catholic Unity. That the bishop of Rome succeeds Peter is brought out explicitly in another place. Cornelius is said to be made bishop "when the place of Fabian, that is, *when the place of Peter* and the degree of the sacerdotal throne was vacant."⁶⁵ Whereas an incident mentioned by Cyprian shows what an important personage the bishop of Rome must be regarded even by the pagans. He tells us that Decius would sooner hear that a rival prince was raised up against him, than that a priest of God was established at Rome. Hence the See had to be left vacant for more than one year before Cornelius was elected. Cyprian also speaks of the party of Novatus "sailing to Rome to overthrow the Church, . . . and since Rome from her greatness plainly ought to take precedence of Carthage,"⁶⁶ his crime is the greater for assailing her. We mention these many facts, for though some are small, yet all combined they make out a strong case for Roman Supremacy.

Another matter which would be strange and hard to explain reasonably unless the See of Rome exercised control over all the Church, is the fact that when the African Church contemplated any new move or modification of discipline she con-

⁶² Ep. 44^s.⁶⁵ Ep. 51^s.⁶³ Ep. 41¹.⁶⁶ Ep. 48^s.⁶⁴ Ep. 44^s.

sulted Rome, and sought its approval for the decision of her councils. In regard to the lapsed, Cyprian consulted Rome twice—first in regard to his own opinion that at least those at the hour of death should be reconciled while the persecution lasted; and when peace was restored, and a council decided to admit all lapsed after various periods of penance, they sent their decision to Cornelius who holding an Italian council confirms their decrees. On the approach of a new persecution, as foreseen by Cyprian, he wished to cut short the period of penance so as to have all reconciled and strengthened for the outbreak.⁶⁷ A council decided accordingly and Rome's approval was sought. Further, when a large assembly of bishops under Cyprian had decided that converts from heresy should be baptized by the Church, he wrote to consult Stephen's "wisdom and gravity," and to obtain his approval.⁶⁸ In fact as we have seen in some previous texts he informed Rome of all the transactions of the African Church. And likely other churches and provinces did the same, but we confine ourselves here to the evidence supplied by Cyprian. We have another custom too of a kindred nature which is most enlightening. How explain, on any other hypothesis than Rome's jurisdiction over the whole Church, the practice of individual bishops who, when for some fault of theirs they got into trouble and were deposed by their colleagues, had recourse to Rome for help and sought through her instrumentality to get restored to their Sees; while the bishops who deprived them of their office as a rule opposed the petition and informed the Pope of the justice of their deposition? And this is true not alone of bishops, but of heretics and schismatics of all kinds. All faced for Rome and strove to make good their case there, in order that she might render them succour and give them recognition beyond their opponents. Of what earthly use would Rome's assistance be unless she had the power to make good her decision, not of course by the sword, for none was more crushed by the temporal rulers than she, but by the spiritual authority she possessed, and by which she was able to admit

⁶⁷ Ep. 53^s.

⁶⁸ Ep. 71.

to or cut off from ecclesiastical communion or from participation in the episcopate any member of the Church the world over? We can quote many instances in illustration of the custom we have mentioned.

When the schismatics were excommunicated by Cyprian they set up an anti-bishop in the person of Fortunatus and sought recognition for him at Rome as bishop of Carthage instead of Cyprian. Writing to Cornelius Cyprian censures their action in these words, remarkable for the forcible epithets applied to the Church of Rome, and that notwithstanding the fact that in the same epistle he expresses himself much aggrieved with Cornelius for having, even through fear, in the least parlied with the schismatics. "After such things, moreover they still dare—a false bishop having been appointed for them by heretics—to set sail and to bear letters from schismatic and profane persons *to the throne of Peter and to the Chief Church whence priestly unity takes its source*, and not to consider that these were the Romans whose faith was praised in the preaching of the Apostle, *to whom faithlessness could have no access.*"⁶⁹ Cyprian's chief complaint against Cornelius for paying any attention to the appeal of the schismatics is not that he had no right or authority, but according to a general law decreed by all the bishops "the case of every one should be heard there where the crime is committed" that accusers and witnesses might be present, and besides, these schismatics had been already sentenced and excommunicated by the African Bishops.

Another instance of a like appeal to Rome from Spain is recorded for us by Cyprian.⁷⁰ Two Spanish bishops, Basilides and Martial, were deposed by their colleagues and people in accordance with a law of Cornelius which decreed that a lapsed bishop should not be allowed to continue to exercise his episcopal or priestly functions. When they were deposed for lapse and many other crimes, two others, Sabinus and Felix, were appointed in the usual way in their stead. Basilides, who at first confessed his crimes and freely resigned his See, after-

⁶⁹ Ep. 54¹⁴. . . .

⁷⁰ Ep. 67. . . .

wards repented and strove to regain the episcopate. For that purpose he came to Rome and fraudulently persuaded Stephen of the injustice of his deposition. It would seem as though Stephen reinstated him in his office, for we find the Spanish bishops seeking advice from the African Council. In reply among other things Cyprian says, "It cannot rescind an ordination rightly perfected that Basilides after the detection of his crimes and the baring of his conscience even by his own confession, went to Rome and deceived Stephen, our colleague, placed at a distance and ignorant of what had been done and of the truth, *to canvass that he might be replaced unjustly in the episcopate* from which he had been righteously deposed." From this transaction two things are evident, namely that Basilides believed Stephen could restore his episcopate to him, while Stephen was equally certain such an action was within his jurisdiction. And Cyprian, while he considers the action invalid but only on the grounds of deception, does not question Stephen's power, in fact, he rather concedes it by the statement, "that he might be replaced unjustly in the episcopate," as though it were within Stephen's competence to restore Basilides, had he decided on true evidence that his cause was just. On Cyprian's letter Dom Chapman remarks that "it is a declaration that Stephen was wickedly deceived. No fault is imputed to him, nor is there any claim to reverse his decision, or to deny his right to give it; it is simply pointed out that it was given on false information, and was therefore null."⁷¹

Another important test case by which Rome's preëminence is clearly set forth is that of Marcian of Arles.⁷² This bishop associated himself with Novation, the schismatic, in denying entirely to the lapsed peace and communion with the Church. His colleagues of the province of Gaul, faithful to the discipline of the universal Church decided on by Cornelius with the other bishops, informed Stephen of Marcian's attitude. On his delay or neglect to take the proper steps to safeguard the flock at Arles, they acquainted Cyprian of the condition of affairs. He, ever zealous and always on the alert

⁷¹ *Loco cit.*

⁷² Ep. 66.

to see that the flock of Christ was not preyed on by wolves at any point, wrote a strong letter to Stephen urging on him his duty. "It behooves you," he says, "to write a very full letter to our fellow bishops in Gaul, not to suffer any longer that Marcian . . . should insult our assembly, because he does not yet seem to be excommunicated by us. . . . Let letters be directed by you into the province and the people abiding at Arles *by which Marcian being excommunicated another may be set up in his place*, and Christ's flock be gathered together. For the glorious honor of our predecessors, the blessed martyrs Cornelius and Lucius, must be maintained, whose memory as we hold in honor much more ought you, dearest brother, to honor and cherish with *your weight and authority* since you have become their vicar and successor." Certainly this passage is powerfully strong in favor of Stephen's Supreme Authority. For had not he jurisdiction over other bishops and even those outside his own province, why should the bishops of Gaul and Cyprian call on him to depose and excommunicate a schismatical bishop, if they could do it equally well themselves? There seems no escape from the conclusion forced on us by this example—that the bishop of Rome enjoyed a primacy of jurisdiction in the Church, and was in real truth an "episcopus episcoporum." We may remark here Cyprian's subsequent seeming inconsistency when in the course of the Re-baptism controversy he apparently teaches that each bishop is wholly independent, and responsible only to God for his actions. How can that statement stand in the face of his present letter to Stephen? We shall soon explain that the contradiction is more apparent than real.

IX. THE RE-BAPTISM CONTROVERSY.

We now come to the last stage of our inquiry, but by no means the least difficult, because it seems to give a set back to all we have contended for hitherto. About the year 255 a question arose in the African Church, which was first debated among the native bishops, but later on developed into more

serious dimensions. Some of the African bishops had doubts whether converts from heresy should be baptized in the Church. The cause of the doubt evidently was because two different practices existed side by side in the Church. All agreed in merely imposing hands, in sign of reconciliation, on those persons who were simply returning to the Church wherein they had been formerly baptized but fell away into schism or heresy. But the dispute existed in regard to those who had gone through the form of baptism in some schismatical or heretical sect and who were entering the Catholic Church for the first time. The Churches of Rome, Palestine, and Alexandria believed, on the strength of custom, that these persons were not to be re-baptized, but were to be admitted to the peace and communion of the Church by the imposition of hands for the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon them—whether for Confirmation or for the remission of sins in the Sacrament of Penance, is not so clear. Africa seems at first to have been divided, but in a short time by the persuasion, advocacy and influence of Cyprian, it was at one with Asia Minor and Syria in upholding the opinion that all such persons were to be baptized on entering the Catholic Church, for outside this Church there is no valid baptism. Baptism is one and can be administered within the true Church only. Those outside the Church can neither baptize nor confirm nor remit sin nor offer sacrifice validly, for there is but one Church, and to be able to perform any of the sacred functions of the Christian religion, one must be her recognized minister. So argued these men. In fact, so far did Cyprian go in maintaining the necessity of membership in the one true Church that he taught that martyrdom for the faith of Christ outside the Catholic fold did not avail one to salvation. So absolutely convinced were the advocates of this view of its truth that they could conceive no other possible, and to hold with Stephen that heretics could validly baptize, by the use of the proper matter and form, those rightly disposed was to their minds giving away the cause of the Church and destroying its unity. But strange to say, in spite of their absolute conviction of the

indisputable truth of their doctrine, still they considered it a free question and were not prepared to compel to their view anybody who might disagree. They considered it a matter of discipline wherein differences of opinion were consistent with Catholic unity.⁷³ Cyprian compares it to a former dispute which existed between the African bishops—one party held that adulterers were to be admitted to communion after a certain period of penance, whereas another section of bishops refused them all reconciliation with the Church, and yet they did not consider that they should break the peace or divide the concord among themselves on that account.⁷⁴ Hence the unutterable indignation of Cyprian and Firmilian with Stephen, who threatened to cut off from ecclesiastical communion all the churches that disagreed, unless they conformed with the Roman custom. Such was the nature of the Re-baptism Controversy. But we must return to its history.

When the question was first raised in Africa and Cyprian was asked for advice by several bishops or bodies of bishops, he wrote letters in reply ably supporting his own view by apparently overwhelming scriptural arguments, and abounding with confidence in the undeniable truth of his own contention. In this way he gained over all the African bishops to his side—not by the exercise of authority, for he held it to be a free matter where each should be left at liberty to follow his own convictions, but by dint of persuasion. At the same time councils were held, and they unanimously decided on the same line of conduct. At one of these, held about Spring, 256, a letter was drawn up by Cyprian embodying and supporting the opinion of the African Church, which was despatched to Stephen for confirmation. "The subject in regard to which we had chiefly to write to you," says Cyprian, "and to confer with your gravity and wisdom, is one that more especially pertains to the priestly authority and to the unity as well as the dignity of the Catholic Church."⁷⁵ Towards the close of the epistle he adds something which must have nettled Stephen, though perhaps all unconsciously on

⁷³ Ep. 51st.⁷⁴ Ep. 71st.⁷⁵ Ep. 71.

Cyprian's part. "We have brought these things," he concludes, "to your knowledge, believing that according to the truth of your religion and faith, those things which are no less religious than true will be approved by you. But we know that some will not lay aside what they have once imbibed, and do not easily change their purpose; but keeping fast the bond of peace and concord among their colleagues, retain certain things peculiar to themselves, which have once been adopted among them. In which behalf we neither do violence to, nor impose a law upon anyone, since each prelate has in the administration of the Church the exercise of his free will, as he shall give an account of his conduct to the Lord."⁷⁵ It is disputed whether Cyprian was aware that Stephen entertained an opinion quite opposed to his, for if so he would scarcely speak so bluntly. His remarks were probably directed against some African colleagues who differed from him. At all events, likely it was when provoked by this letter that Stephen determined on the extreme course of cutting off from the Church all the churches of Africa and Asia Minor unless they laid aside their practice and conformed themselves to the traditional custom. He took Cyprian's advice in regard to the protection of the Church's unity and dignity, but in a manner that the adviser never anticipated. Whether Stephen's menace had reached Carthage before the Seventh Council of Carthage was held, in September, 256, is exceedingly doubtful, and in weighing evidence for and against its antecedent arrival we rather incline to think it had not, and hence most probably the envoys from Carthage to Rome who were denied an audience and refused hospitality by Stephen, were those who brought the sentences of the eighty-seven bishops who at this Council pronounced to a man in favor of re-baptizing heretics. The opening address of Cyprian himself is worth quoting, for if directed against Stephen and if intended by its speaker to be literally and absolutely true, it is a strong point against the opinion we advocate that Cyprian believed in the primacy of the bishops of Rome.⁷⁶ Here are his words at length: "It remains

⁷⁶ For able discussion on this see Art. by P. St. John, S. J., in *A. E. R.*, Aug., 1903.

that each of us should bring forward what we think on this matter, judging no man, nor rejecting any man from the right of communion if he should think differently from us. For neither does any of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops nor by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleagues to the necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another, than he himself can judge another. But let us all wait for the judgment of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only one that has power both of preferring us in the government of His Church, and of judging us in our conduct there." Now, our reasons for believing this Council was held before the knowledge of Stephen's threat had arrived, and as a consequence that they are not a covert hit at him and a repudiation of his action, are chiefly these. If we suppose this Council was assembled on the receipt of Stephen's charge, and with the sole object of flinging back with disdain that charge, it would be inexplicable how Stephen's name is not mentioned by one of the eighty-seven bishops who spoke, except once in connection with Cyprian's letter to him, which we are told was read at the opening of the Council with three or four other epistles. Imagine the circumstances. A threat of excommunication hung over the heads of all the fathers of the Council unless they yielded up their own custom for that of Rome, and yet all present support the African custom, while among so many spokesmen not a hint or a word is let drop that the consequence of their proceedings will be disruption of ecclesiastical unity. And this is all the more astounding if we are to take Cyprian's address as literally true and deny that Stephen had any power over the African church, for in that case, wherefore the complete silence? Would it be in human nature not to reject with contempt Stephen's unwarranted assumption of authority? And our amazement still further increases when we take into account the little reserve observed subsequently by Cyprian in his letter to Pompey, and by Firmilian in his letter to Cyprian. In these neither Stephen's name nor fame was spared, but he was denounced in the most

unmeasured terms. From these considerations we must conclude that the Council of Carthage was not guilty of disobedience to the dictates of Stephen, for his commands were not before them. And we must take it that the two letters referred to, which furnish us with the information of Stephen's decision were penned on the receipt of the orders from Rome subsequent to the Council. The only reason why it has been held that that Council assailed Stephen is deduced from the opening address. But these words can be well explained on other grounds, and in fact a parallel to every sentence uttered there, can be found in previous letters of Cyprian. That the words were not and could not be meant in more than a certain limited sense can be gathered from what we have already said, and will become clearer still from what we shall say presently.

But even if the foregoing be granted as the correct view, it will be further asked how in the face of the two letters of Cyprian⁷⁷ and Firmilian, can we maintain for a moment that their authors believed that Stephen enjoyed supreme power over the Church? If they considered him their superior—the primate of the Catholic Church, the Controller and Guardian of its unity, how could two such excellent and God-fearing bishops uphold their view against his, and denounce him in the fiercest and most vehement manner because he enforced his teaching under pain of excommunication? How could Firmilian say, that should Stephen execute his threat he would but cut himself off from communion with the Church? Would it not be proper for good bishops to submit to higher authority did it exist, or at least to humbly dissuade it from a course of action so fraught with ruin to the Church at large?

Well, we must confess that on the evidence even of these two epistles alone, which we have carefully scrutinized in order to try and interpret the minds of the authors, we are convinced rather of Rome's supremacy than the contrary. Leaving aside the action of Stephen himself which has an argument all its own for his supreme authority (for surely he did not issue a threat unless he was conscious of the power to execute it)

⁷⁷ Ep. 73 and 74.

we have not found in both these letters any expression which could be taken as certain denial of Rome's primacy. On the other hand, they contain a few passages which strongly sustain that doctrine, while we can explain their attitude towards Stephen as reasonable and consistent with their belief in his primacy. Take the epistle of Cyprian to Quintus,⁷⁸ where after he had argued well for his view he suggests that his opponents who rely on tradition should adopt his view because custom should yield to reason and truth. This statement he corroborates by a scriptural illustration. "For neither did Peter," he says, "whom first the Lord chose and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul disputed with him afterwards about circumcision, claim to himself anything insolently, nor arrogantly assume anything, so as to say that he held the primacy, and that he ought rather to be obeyed by novices and those lately come; nor did he despise Paul because he had previously been a persecutor of the Church, but admitted the counsel of the truth, and easily yielded to the lawful reason Paul asserted, furnishing thus an illustration to us both of concord and of patience, that we should not obstinately love our own opinions, but should rather adopt as our own those which are at any time carefully and wholesomely suggested by our brethren and colleagues if they be true and lawful." If this passage is meant to draw a parallel for anybody, it must be certainly for Stephen, for who else could be supposed to hold the place of Peter? In this case it furnishes an inevitable argument for his supremacy as Cyprian's point is that Peter though primate, was not autocratic and imperious in the use of his high office, but yielded to the counsel of his inferiors. From which the manifest conclusion Cyprian wishes to have drawn is that Peter's successor should be equally condescending and humble, and so accept the truth which he himself propounds. Firmilian also in his epistle while saying many bitter things about Stephen, still does not question his authority but rather concedes it in one paragraph, while condemning its abuse in behalf of a false and bad cause.⁷⁹ "And in this respect," he says, "I am justly indignant at this so

⁷⁸ Ep. 70^a.⁷⁹ Ep. 74¹⁷.

open and manifest folly of Stephen, that he who so boasts of the place of his episcopate, and contends that he holds the succession from Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, should introduce many other rocks and establish new buildings of many churches; maintaining by his authority that there is baptism in them. . . . Stephen who announces that he holds by succession the throne of Peter, is stirred with no zeal against heretics when he concedes to them not a moderate but the very greatest power of grace."

Now in the evidence of such quotations as these, and from the whole epistles in which they are contained, it becomes manifest that the grievance against Stephen is not that he exercised control over the whole Church as successor of Peter whose primacy he claimed to inherit, but that he exercised this power in the interests of heretics and schismatics, and to the detriment of the Church's unity. From which it is clear we can draw from the opposition of Cyprian and Firmilian no argument against Stephen's supremacy but solely against his infallibility. But the latter we readily grant—they felt absolutely sure that Stephen and his followers were in error and their intolerable grievance was that he strove to propagate an error at the expense even of the Church communion and unity. It will be readily seen then that the whole *impasse* was brought about by an error of doctrine on the part of Cyprian and his friends, together with their ignorance of papal infallibility, which does not seem to have been well grasped at this early period. And we can easily conceive a similar set of circumstances to-day where a like result could be produced even with our definite notions of the Pope's supremacy, were it not that we are equally aware of the concomitant prerogative of papal infallibility. For what would occur, in the hypothesis that the Pope were supreme but fallible only, if he were to enforce on some collection of churches a doctrine or practice opposed to their own long-established and confirmed traditions and one which they felt absolutely convinced was erroneous—what would be likely to happen if he did this under threat of excommunication unless they yielded obedience? Would they not obstinately cling to what they considered the obvious truth

and resist with all their might the imposition of error, despite the menaced punishment? Was not this the identical position occupied by the churches of Africa and Asia Minor, and is it not consistent with the recognition of the Roman Supremacy on their part? Fortunately such a situation cannot now arise, at least in the matter of doctrine, because papal supremacy, the guardian of Catholic unity, is hedged round by the defined gift of papal infallibility.

In this controversy St. Cyprian believed himself in possession of the truth. He was convinced that the question in dispute was a free matter where each bishop could hold his own consistently with the peace and concord and unity of the Church. Hence it was a case where one was subject to no ecclesiastical authority but responsible directly to God. To take his address to the Council as meaning that a bishop was to be guided by his conscience alone and had no superior in the Church, is to flatly contradict the evidence of many facts already adduced, as those of Marcian of Arles, Rogatianus of Assuræ, Privatus of Lambesa, Basilides and Martial of Spain—where Cyprian himself so prominently figured. He recognized then that bishops had a superior in the Church, and that superior beyond all others was the occupant of the See of Peter at Rome. Such is the conclusion we are led to by the study of St. Cyprian. The admiration we must entertain for this high-souled churchman and generous servant of God, causes us to regret the controversy which stained the fair name of an otherwise unsullied and brilliant character. But even in his error his struggle was for the truth, and while he imperilled Catholic Unity, he did battle in its cause. "Thus, although there was a great deal of keenness," says St. Augustine in regard to these two doughty champions of the Church—Stephen and Cyprian—, "Yet it was always in a spirit of brotherhood and at length the peace of Christ conquered in their hearts so that in such a dispute none of the mischief of Schism arose between them."⁸⁰

CORNELIUS F. CREMIN, S. T. L.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY,
ST. PAUL, MINN.

⁸⁰ *Contra Donatistas*, v, 25.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité. Jules Lebreton. Beauchesne, Paris, 1910. Pp. xxvi + 569.

As its title indicates, this volume deals exclusively with the origins of the dogma of the Trinity, leaving to a later study the consideration of the writings of the Fathers. It is not so much the rule as the expression of faith which the author has in view throughout. He inquires at great and learned length into the different doctrines, Jewish and Pagan, which are wrongly supposed by rationalists to have been the source of the dogma of the Trinity, such as Hellenism, Stoicism, the Old Testament theology, Palestinian Judaism, and the Alexandrian form of Judaism known as Philonism. This review of the religious thought of the Graeco-Roman world is a fine piece of work, clear, to the point, and characterized by a manner of treatment which is well worthy of imitation by other critics working in the same or kindred fields. We have long been accustomed to the comparative method which consists in setting side by side with the Christian conception of the Word of God the Pagan or Jewish notions of the same, both torn from their context and exhibited in shreds or patches, the object of this patchwork procedure being to show the derivation of the former from the latter. Father Lebreton is to be congratulated for having defeated the purpose and results of this partial method of comparison, dear to rationalists of a familiar type, and it is to be hoped that when the pre-Christian doctrines are presented, not piecemeal, but in their entirety, the transcendence of Christian faith will force itself upon the consideration of those critics who are now bending their endeavors to reduce it to the level of contemporaneous belief.

In the part devoted to the Christian revelation, Father Lebreton again turns the tables on the critics, clearly and cogently showing that Jesus was from the very beginning the revealer and at the same time the object of the Christian dogma. The author studies the titles, Father, Son, Son of God, Holy Ghost, Lord, in all their accompanying contexts, leaving the different elements of the trinitarian dogma in their rich, living, and complex original complexity, without attempting to simplify them unduly. This study is carried through all the New Testament writings, and covers all the connected problems with a richness and detail of treatment which cannot be reproduced within

the allotted compass of a review. The result is to bring out into salient relief the distinctive, underived character of the Christian dogma of the Trinity. It was Christ who made christology; it was not a christology of unknown source and import which made Jesus divine.

Valuable summaries of the evidence, and of patristic and mediaeval interpretations, accompany the discussion of the problems concerning "the three heavenly witnesses," and "the ignorance of the day of judgment." That the doctrine of the Logos was not taken over from Philo is proved to the hilt. Five tables at the end of the volume make readily accessible to student or reader the vast store of the author's information. It is safe to say that there is nothing of the kind in English to compare with this work of Father Lebreton's in balance of judgment, or fairness, clearness, and fulness of presentation.

One point, at least, invites criticism after all this general praise. The question of Christ's human knowledge is historically reviewed and theologically discussed in a lengthy note of nearly thirty pages (447-469), in which, first of all, Petavius is taken to task for saying that the doctrine of several of the Greek Fathers concerning the voluntarily assumed ignorance of Christ, especially with regard to the day of judgment, is akin to the proscribed heresy of the Agnoetes, who attributed complete ignorance to the Savior. Then, after reviewing the texts of the Fathers, and the doctrine of Saint Thomas, the author finds that the former considered Christ's human nature as an imperfect instrument of the divinity, whereas the latter took the other point of view that the divinity conferred a special title to perfection on the humanity united with it. These differences of standpoint, so the author thinks, profoundly affect the doctrinal positions which the Fathers and the Schoolmen respectively adopt on the question of Christ's assumed defects. The human infirmities of Christ, that of ignorance among the number, says the author, were dear to the Greeks, who took the ground that Christ assumed these infirmities in order to purify all humanity and to make a holy offering of it, thus purified, to God; whereas Saint Thomas, who was less preoccupied with this soteriological notion of the Greek Fathers, was correspondingly less concerned to acknowledge in Christ the existence of the human infirmities in question.

The question of affirming or denying that Christ was humanly ignorant of the day of judgment, refunds, according to the author, into another question, whether, namely, we are obliged to admit the conclusion of Saint Thomas that the human soul of Christ always

enjoyed actual knowledge of all that is real ; or, whether we are free to adopt in its stead the conclusion of Saint Bonaventure, Henry of Ghent, Scotus, and Marsilius of Inghen, that Christ's intuitive vision was habitual and not actual. The author is of the opinion that the way is still open to this latter theory, and he accordingly makes it his own, as more in keeping with early tradition and also as the more profound view to be taken of the matter.

It strikes the reviewer that in coming to this conclusion the author has failed to take into sufficient account the fact that there has been a progress in theological explanation which has closed the door on the two points to which he would have us revert. In the first place, the view which the Greeks took of human nature, and its identity or solidarity with Christ's and Adam's is altogether too mystical and ill-defined to be revived at this late day as a working principle in soteriology. The Greeks contented themselves, as a rule, with stating the facts of this universal solidarity without stopping to analyze how it was or could be realized, and it seems too much therefore to ask us to return to this physico-mystical conception of theirs concerning the redemption of mankind, at least as a leading principle. In the very passage to which the author refers (3^a, xv, 3, ad. 1), Saint Thomas disposed of this soteriological principle of the Greeks when he said that the human nature of Christ might be viewed in two ways ; either in general according to its kind, or individually according to "that which it has from its union with the divine person." The Greeks understood human nature in general, Saint Thomas abandoned this abstract point of view for the individual, concrete way of looking at the problem. And surely the union of an individual human nature with the Divine, concretely affected by the sublime mode of union itself, is far more worthy of first place as a constructive principle in soteriology than is the mystic union of all men with Christ, and the consequence which follows from it that the Savior voluntarily assumed our intellectual defects along with others to hallow and cure them. If the latter were the case, might not this voluntary ignorance go hand in hand with error, and amount to nothing more in the end than a convenient way of pushing the solution of a problem a step or two further back?

Furthermore, with regard to the central question whether the beatific vision was actual at all times, or merely at voluntary command, it strikes the reviewer that Saint Thomas created progress here also when, in disposing of the distinction introduced by his friend, Saint Bonaventure, he said that from the very nature of the beatific

vision, which was not through "species" or successive concepts, it must have been always simultaneously actual, if had at all (III Sent., Dist. XVI, a. 2, q. 4). So that the solution which the author reviews and proposes, viewed in the light of history alone, far from being more profound than that of Saint Thomas, seems rather to neglect the intervening progress of theology, and to land us back again in the mysticism of the Greeks, to which, by the way, Saint Bonaventure was no stranger. At any rate, the proposed solution seems to create more difficulties in soteriology than it solves in christology. All things considered, the actualist theory of the beatific vision of Christ, advanced by Saint Thomas, indicates, it seems to us, a corrective stage of development in the precision of theological thought rather than a tighter drawing of the reins. The choice would seem to lie, not between two competing theories of explanation, but between a theory which can be consistently thought out, and one that cannot, because of its inherent mysticism.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Il progresso Dogmatico nel Concetto Cattolico. Aurelio Palmieri, O. S. A. Firenze. Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1910. Pp. 303.

The double purpose of refuting the destructive theories of recent rationalists, and of correcting the misapprehensions of schismatic Greeks concerning the development of Catholic doctrine, is best served, according to the author of this volume—the first to appear in a series of apologetic works—by an accurate study of the progress of dogma as the Catholic theologian conceives it. The Catholic conception is not understood. The old Protestant notion that Christianity is to be exhumed out of documents, and restored, so to speak, after the manner of fossilized remains, helps to account for much of this misunderstanding, because it falsely suggests that a living tradition can be fairly and completely judged by the dead letter of a book, as if stagnation were the proper test to be applied to truths that live and grow without losing their identity. The Protestant critic of the liberal type seems to have inherited the prejudice of his more orthodox brethren, for he still assumes that Christianity is condemned to remain forever in a sort of doctrinal infancy. The orthodox Greek is under the impression that Christian doctrine suddenly stopped growing about the time of the seventh ecumenical council; he regards it as no longer possible, after the end of the eighth century, to determine the existence of revealed truths, or to make progress in their understanding and explanation.

By neither of these critics is taken into just account the Catholic principle of an ever-living, continuous, authoritatively maintained, and divinely guided tradition; hence the oft-repeated charge of the forging of new dogmas. Approaching the problem of dogmatic development with the thought in mind that divine truth was stereotyped once for all in the Bible, the Protestant critic is misled into seeing novelty and corruption where an unbiased historian discovers the simple fact of growth. It does not seem strange, therefore, that a recent English convert to the faith of his fathers should date the beginning of his conversion from the day he finished reading Harnack's history of dogma. On the other hand, the orthodox Greek finds the Catholic doctrine of progress good enough for eight centuries in the history of his own church, but it becomes an abuse in his eyes after he has ceased to have further use for it himself; all of which leads one to suspect that the Greek cuts the continuity of history merely to suit himself and to justify a schismatic situation.

The pragmatist, who tries to pack all history into the single category of progressive change, overlooks the divine element in Christianity, and is altogether too much impressed by the human, the result being that all evidence of permanency is set at nought, and variation is falsely made the very essence of truth and reality. It is clear then that the two extremes of perpetual change and perpetual stagnation have to be avoided as approaches to the problem of dogmatic development, or as legitimate inferences therefrom; and when they are avoided, nothing is left of the charge of publishing new dogmas and of poisoning the wells of evangelism. This charge rests in the main, as was said, on a failure to note the difference between the dead letter of a book and the living voice which interprets it. The futility of recent attempts to find in the experience of the individual the link that binds the Christian soul in continuity with the past only goes to show that *the Church* is needed far more than *a book*.

The author clears up the situation by a lengthy, detailed exposition of the Catholic doctrine of the relative progress of dogma, according to which the substance of the truth believed remains constant, even though accompanied by accidental changes of mode when passing from the implicit to the explicit, from the obscure to the clear stage. Relative progress excludes all numerical addition since the death of the last apostle, and consists, as Saint Anselm said, "rather in the advance of the believer in faith (by explanation and understanding) than in the advance of faith in the believer." This advance is not due to any immanent driving-principle of progress present in the truths them-

selves, as the modernist would have it, but to the *consciously exercised* guidance of the Church. A clear distinction is needed between dogma and theology, because the modernists have tried to blot out the line that parts them and that also connects them each with the other. The characteristics of dogma are absolute truth ; of theological opinion, defectibility ; the latter are human products. The magistracy of the Church attests the divine origin of dogma and is rigorous in its regard, but it allows varying degrees of latitude and liberty to theological opinions, confining itself to judging whether the latter conform to revelation. The Catholic theory of dogmatic progress steers a middle course between the extremes already mentioned. Theological opinions do not constitute the development of dogma—they are not the efficient, but merely the occasional causes of its progress.

The author pursues his exposition into more detail than the limited space of a review allows us to reproduce. Suffice it to say that many good and telling points are made against the rationalist and pragmatic theories, and the unjustly one-sided views of Loisy, Le Roy, and Tyrrell. One unusual feature of the volume is the wide range of acquaintance which the author has with the contemporary literature of the Eastern Church, both Greek and Russian ; he has access to a world not generally dealt with in books of the kind.

A few points suggest themselves for criticism. The author would have aided the reader greatly by defining the term 'dogma' at the beginning of the volume either in the text or in an appended footnote. The author's pen slips twice in saying that "the intellect is discursive by nature" (pp. 22, 204); and yet in another passage (p. 42) he clearly realizes that, so far from being confined to discourse, the intellect is a penetrative power that reaches reality before it reasons about it. In view of the fact that the modernist opponents of intellectualism persistently confound 'reason' with 'reasoning,' as if deduction and inference were the primary and sole functions on which scholastic philosophy and theology rely, it would be more timely to insist on the immediate character of the intellect, so as to bring out saliently the fact that the primacy of reason which we Catholics uphold is not the primacy of reasoning. The addition of analytical tables of topics and authors would also facilitate the use of the volume for students. But these are minor blemishes, if they are such at all. It is an advantage to have at hand clearly stated against the extreme theories of absolute progress and absolute stagnation the Catholic doctrine of relative development, which safeguards the permanent element without destroying the progressive, which is rich in life and growing

thought, in utter despite of those contemporary critics who travesty it as dead, static, and stereotyped, all because they themselves are not alive to its true significance.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Questions Historiques: I. *L'existence historique de Jésus et le rationalisme contemporain*, par L. Cl. Fillion. Paris, Librairie Bloud et Cie, 1909. Pp. 64. Price, 0, fr. 60.

II. *Histoire du Catholicisme en Angleterre*, par Gabriel Planque, 3^e édition. Paris, Librairie Bloud et Cie, 1909. Pp. 127.

III. *Les Croisades*, par Adrien Fortin. 2^e édition. Paris, Librairie Bloud et Cie, 1909. Pp. 63.

IV. *Le comité de salut public*, par Marcel Navarre. 2^e édition. Paris, Librairie Bloud et Cie, 1909. Pp. 64.

I. In the first of these brochures which form part of the large popular collection "Science et Religion," Father Fillion, the well-known Scriptural writer, presents a refutation of the systems denying the historic reality of Jesus. He confines himself to the discussion of the problem of His existence without examining the further question of His nature and character. After a brief general statement of the question, the author exposes the systems of C. F. Dupuis, of Bruno Bauer and his followers, of W. B. Smith, of P. Jensens and especially that of the late Protestant clergyman, Albert Kalthoff. This exposition is followed by the proofs in favor of the personal existence of Jesus. They are derived from three classes of witnesses: Pagan, Jewish and Christian. Among the Christian sources special stress is laid on the testimony of St. Paul. The argumentation is clear and well conducted; here and there, the author appropriately cites in his favor the opinion of advanced non-Catholic scholars.

II. The little book of Gabriel Planque gives an accurate and very readable summary of the history of the Church in England from the beginning to 1829, the crowning year of Catholic Emancipation. It is divided into two parts, covering respectively the period antecedent and the time subsequent to the Reformation. A chronological table of the principal events concludes the work. A few bibliographical indications are appended to each chapter. They would be more serviceable if they were more explicit. In the chapter on Emancipation the difficulties with which the English government was confronted in the colonies and

in its foreign relations are not mentioned among the causes which led to the gradual concession of religious and civil liberty to Catholics.

III. In his somewhat elementary but clear history of the Crusades, Adrien Fortin rightly devotes little space to the description of military events to give more attention to the causes and results of these great religious and military expeditions, and to the conditions in which they took place. While the statements are usually accurate, it may be well to point out that the river Seleph in which Frederick Barbarossa was drowned is in Cilicia and not in Syria (p. 37), and that the same emperor should not appear in the Holy Land with his army (p. 38), after his death on the way has been recorded. On p. 10, Hastings where the decisive battle of 1066 was fought, figures as the name of an English king. There are also some avoidable repetitions (cf. pp. 12 and 20, 14 and 43), but, on the whole, the work will contribute to spread a correct knowledge and just appreciation of the Crusades.

IV. Marcel Navarre places before us the history of that famous institution of the French Revolution known under the name of Committee of Public Safety. He relates its formation, gives an account of its work under the preponderating influence of Danton and of Robespierre and assigns the reasons for its suppression. He recognizes the military successes which it achieved, but cannot help execrating, in a very strongly worded conclusion, the "régime of hatred and tyranny" of the French Revolution.

N. A. WEBER, S. M.

The Glories of Lourdes, by the Chanoine Justin Rousseil, translated from the second edition by the Rev. Joseph Murphy, S. J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1909. Benziger Bros., \$1.10 net. Pp. xxiv + 326.

It was a happy thought which prompted Father Murphy to give us an English translation of the successful and brilliant work of Canon Rousseil. The purpose of the translator, as he tells us in his preface, was to make Lourdes known and to contribute to the increase of devotion to Our Blessed Lady. It must be confessed that no truly Catholic heart can read this attractive work without experiencing feelings of sympathetic interest in the shrine of Lourdes and sentiments of loving gratitude to the munificent Queen of Heaven. The book does not give a connected and complete history of Lourdes from the time of the apparitions to that of its publication, but presents in twelve chapters an interesting account of the leading events and principal personages

—living or dead—connected with the shrine. Its pages breathe an ardent spirit of devotion to Mary and a patriotic love of France. Lourdes is rightly depicted as a centre which has deeply influenced the religious life of the eldest daughter of the Church and of the rest of the world. Judgment and tact are usually displayed in the interpretation of texts and events. Many readers, however, will demur when they come across the alleged clear references to Lourdes in the Old Testament (pp. 18–21, 272), or the definition of papal infallibility viewed as an indirect result of Our Lady's apparition to Bernadette Soubirous. The translation betrays insufficient knowledge of proper names: p. 4, "Gerbert" should be Gerbet; Nièvre is a department, and not a town as "at Nièvre" (p. 103) seems to indicate; on the same page, "Dames des Nevers" should be Dames de Nevers; p. 192, "Reichstadt" stands for Reichsrat, p. 228, Pius for Pie, Bishop of Poitiers. The expressions Mgr. d'Angers (p. 284) and Mgr. de Pamiers (p. 287) to designate the bishop of Angers and the bishop of Pamiers are hardly clear to English readers. The name of Cardinal Lecot does not occur frequently, but is misspelt wherever it occurs (pp. 286, 294). These are however, only minor deficiencies which cannot destroy the value of an otherwise excellent work.

N. A. WEBER, S. M.

The Poems of James Ryder Randall. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Matthew Page Andrews, M. A. 8vo. Pages 221. The Tandy-Thomas Company, New York, 1910.

Admirers of this long neglected poet of the South now have for the first time the opportunity to know Randall and his poems at their best. In 1908 a small but very incomplete volume appeared. This hastily prepared book is now superseded by the present edition which presents many other poems hitherto unpublished, added to which are a very interesting biographical sketch and several illustrations and many notes bearing upon the composition and interpretation of the contents.

It is refreshing to see that Randall is at last coming into his own, and that he is becoming known as a poet of no mean rank, as the composer of many other poems of genuine merit besides the famous war song, "Maryland, my Maryland." Like pretty much all Southern poets, he has been neglected by fame as he was by fortune. Singers south of the Potomac seemed to have cared very little about the pecuniary value of their inspiration. The editor tells us that Mr.

Randall never wrote a line of verse for money. In this respect his fate recalls the sad experiences of Poe, Lanier and Ryan. Added to their own indifference or ill luck or lack of business-scent, these poets have been as well neglected by the South generally, a strange contrast to the comparative prosperity which smiled upon the poets of the North and the care taken by the North to make its great men known and honored. Every school-boy in the United States has heard of Longfellow. A few cultivated men know that Lanier was in some ways an infinitely more gifted poet or that John B. Tabb was perhaps the most delicate poet the English world has produced in many a generation. Perhaps some day the general reader will likewise realize that Mr. Randall wrote some poems which as poems are distinctly superior to his "Maryland," and which for sweet purity of feeling can rank with some of Longfellow's. If so it be, then the editor of these poems has performed a good service, an act of tardy justice to the fame of a genuine poet, who, amidst more prosperous circumstances than those afforded by the South "after the war," might with care have produced poetry of a very high quality.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

A Compendium of Catechetical Instruction. Rev. Angelo Raineri. Edited by Rev. John Hagan, Vice-Rector, Irish College, Rome. The Sacraments. 2 vols. 8vo. 1908. The Commandments. 2 vols. 8vo. 1909. Benziger, New York.

The present compendium might appropriately be called a popular manual of sacramental and moral theology. It is an orderly systematic summary of the truths of faith and morals which a Catholic layman should know. Abstruse discussions are of course omitted, but more pertinent matters are lucidly and thoroughly elaborated; in fact, often more thoroughly than in the standard text-books. The instructions are the matured fruit of forty years labor in the pulpit of the Cathedral of Milan. During these years they were repeatedly restudied, amplified and restated by their author. They were published after his death in 1840, from manuscripts left by him and since then have run through many editions in the Italian original as well as in the French translation. Their continued survival in a field so crowded with competitors should be their best recommendation.

Father Raineri makes no show of theological erudition, and no attempt at oratorical effect. His instructions are not polished sermons,

but plain, sober, familiar talks. While not particularly original, they show judicious selection and painstaking thought to render them exhaustive. The illustrations are rather colorless, but the concrete applications of moral principles are both abundant and incisive. Considerable attention is given to demolishing the pretexts of those who wish to shirk responsibilities, and of those who consciously or half-consciously endeavor by specious reasoning to calm an uneasy conscience in matters not grossly nor palpably sinful. This leads the author at times into somewhat subtle and complex psychological analysis. It is however necessary sometimes to call attention to these possibilities of self-deception, as, for instance, in explaining the nature of contrition for sin. This can usually be done without bewildering those untrained in accurate introspection, or aggravating the spiritual hypochondria of the scrupulous, and Father Raineri's clear exposition, used discriminately, should prove helpful.

The editor has prefixed to each group of instructions the corresponding sections in English of the *Catechismus Romanus* and the Catechism prescribed by Pius X in 1905 for the province of Rome. These extracts cover 221 of the 536 pages in the volumes on the Sacraments and 127 of the 673 pages in the volumes on the commandments. The course need not be given in its entirety, but as a reference work supplies in convenient form a wealth of practical, solid and suggestive material from which to choose.

JOHN M. COOPER.

The Catechism in Examples. By Rev. Donald A. Chisolm, priest of the diocese of Aberdeen. Second edition in 5 volumes. 12mo. Benziger, 1908-1909.

Those who have familiar experience of the difficulty of making catechetical instruction clear and interesting will be grateful to Father Chisolm for the new edition of his "*Catechism in Examples.*" The work has been considerably revised and augmented. What strikes one at once is the abundance of material offered. There are over three hundred illustrations and stories in each volume. In such a large collection, we naturally find some unevenness, but the examples are rarely trivial or bizarre, and nearly all are selected with admirable judgment. They are such as appeal strongly to the imagination, the dramatic feeling and the imitative instinct of the child, and, for that matter, of the adult as well. The lives and legends of the saints are drawn upon extensively, though the other fields have been worked over well. The

extracts from missionary annals lead one to wish that this source had been used even more freely. While the fact and punishment of sin are not balked at or glossed over, Father Chisolm has apparently made his selection rather with the view of directly encouraging and fortifying the child's better impulses, of positively arousing and vivifying his natural love of goodness and affection for God, than of frightening him into doing right. The work should prove a valuable aid to priests, catechists and parents, and would be read with pleasure and profit in Catholic homes.

JOHN M. COOPER.

Fr. Petri de Aquila O. F. M. Cognomento Scotelli, B. Joannis Duns Scoti Discipuli, *Commentaria in quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi*, edita a Fr. Cypriano Paolini O. F. M. Prov. Corsicae, 4 vols. 8° (Levanti, Conv. SSmae Annuntiationis, 1907-1909). Pp. 440, 435, 249 and 406.

Father Cyprain Paolini, O. F. M., already favorably known by his new editions of Frassen's "*Scotus Academicus*" (Rome, Typo. Sallustiana, 12 vols. 8°, 1900-1902) and Montefortino's "*Summa Theologica Scoti*" (*ibid.* 6 vols. 8°, 1900-1903), has rendered the students of the Subtle Doctor an additional service by re-editing Peter of Aquila's Commentary on the Sentences. In this work the "Doctor Sufficiens," as Peter of Aquila was called, has explained the four books of Sentences according to the teaching of Scotus in which he was deeply versed, hence the name of "Scotellus" which was later on given the author, not so much because he was a disciple of Scotus, as because he resembled the latter in ingenuity and subtlety. Peter of Aquila, who was successively Inquisitor at Florence (1344), Bishop of S. Angelo (1347), and of Trivento (1348), died in 1361. His Commentary was published at Speier in 1480, at Venice in 1501 and 1584, and at Paris in 1585. The second Venetian edition was issued under the auspices of Cardinal Buccafoci with annotations and a copious index. The present edition is well printed and is sold at the low price of two lire a volume. The whole work may be heartily commended to all those interested in the doctrines of Scotus and Scholasticism in general.

FERDINAND HECKMAN, O. F. M.

Lectures on the History of Religions. Vols. I-IV. 12mo.
St. Louis, Herder; London, Catholic Truth Society, 1910.
60 cents the volume.

These cheap, handy volumes ought to prove a welcome addition to the library of the busy Catholic reader. Not a few of the works that have thus far appeared on the study of religions have been written with an anti-Catholic, if not with an anti-Christian, bias. The present volumes offer the Catholic reader a rapid, intelligible survey of the chief religious systems of the world, under the guidance of able scholars whose reputation for ability and for sound Catholic faith are a guarantee that what they have to say is fair and reliable. Each volume consists of eight studies by different writers, of an average length of thirty-two pages. Thus in volume I, Father Wieger, S. J., writes on the Religion of China, Professor McNeill on the Celtic Religions, Professor de la Vallée Poussin on Buddhism, Father Hull, S. J., on Hinduism, Father Condamin, S. J., on the Religions of Babylonia and Assyria, Father Hitchcock on the Religion of Ancient Syria, and Father Mallon, S. J., on the Religions of Egypt. In volume II, among the important subjects treated are the religion of ancient Persia, that of the Avesta, and Mithraism. Volume III is devoted chiefly to the study of the various phases of Catholicism, and volume IV treats of Judaism, Islamism, the Eastern Churches, and some of the important forms of Protestantism. A large amount of useful and interesting information is to be found in these modest, well printed volumes.

CHARLES F. AIKIN.

Grundriss der Apologetik, dritte Auflage, von Gerhard Rauschen.
Bonn, Hanstein, 1910. 8vo., 87 pp.
Glaubenslehre, dritte Auf., ditto, 1909. ~ 8vo., 120 pp.
Sittenlehre, dritte Auf., ditto, 1909. 8vo., 95 pp.

These three small volumes, together with a corresponding volume on Church History, go to make up a course of religious instruction suited to pupils of high schools and academies. The apologetic part sets forth in successive stages the grounds of theistic, Christian, and Catholic belief. The dogmatic part treats of the unity and trinity of God, of creation (physical world, men and angels), of the person and redemptive work of Jesus, of grace and its sacramental channels, and of the

final destiny of man. The moral part, after giving clear notions of law, conscience, and free will, of virtue and sin, expounds our duties to God as suggested by the first three Commandments, and our duties to ourselves and to our neighbor as contained in the other seven. As a popular presentation of Catholic teaching, this series is worthy of high commendation by reason of its clearness, conciseness, and solidity of reasoning.

CHARLES F. AIKIN.

Einführung in die Hebraische Sprache für den Schulgebrauch,
von Joseph Prill, Gymnasialprofessor zu Essen. Dritte vermehrte
und verbesserte Auflage. Bonn, Peter Hanstein, 1910.

This book, now in its third edition, is an excellent elementary grammar of the Hebrew language. Its chief merits are its clearness and conciseness. Within the small compass of 174 pages it contains the essentials of Hebrew grammar, a short account of Hebrew poetry, and a well selected Chrestomathy with Glossary. Exercises in translation and prose are given at the end of every number, thus enabling the student to make a practical application of the rules and principles he has learned. This is a praiseworthy feature too often wanting in books of this kind. We earnestly recommend this grammar to beginners; it will help them to read with more profit the larger standard works on the same subject.

A. A. VASCHALDE.

MISCELLANEOUS.

National Conference of Catholic Charities.

The April issue of the *Catholic University Bulletin* contained a reference to a meeting which was held at the University, February 19th and 20th, 1910, for the purpose of considering the advisability and feasibility of creating a National Conference of Catholic Charities. The outcome of that meeting was the formation of a temporary organization and a decision to hold a national meeting at the Catholic University during the summer just past. The meeting took place September 25th to 28th. Approximately 400 delegates were in attendance, representing 24 States or 38 cities. The greatest enthusiasm was manifested throughout, while the earnestness and ability shown throughout the papers and the discussions were of such a character as to give to the Conference a tone of marked superiority. The appearance of the printed report of the Conference will give occasion for more extended notice in the *Bulletin*. Permanent organization was effected and a constitution was adopted. It was decided to hold the next Conference at the Catholic University during the summer of 1912.

The following are the names of the original Committee which created the National Conference :

Honorary President : His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons.

President : Rt. Rev. Monsignor T. J. Shahan, Rector Catholic University.

Treasurer : Hon. Wm. H. De Lacy.

Secretary : Rev. Dr. Wm. J. Kerby.

Executive Committee—Provisional.

Barnabas, Brother	Lincolndale, N. Y.
Biggs, Robert	Baltimore, Md.
Brooks, Joseph W.	Baltimore, Md.
Butler, Edmond J.	New York City.
Crane, Richard	Cincinnati, O.
Crimmins, John D.	New York City.
Dempsey, Rev. Timothy	St. Louis, Mo.
De Lacy, Hon. Wm. H.	Washington, D. C.

Downey, Wm. F.	Washington, D. C.
Doyle, Michael F.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Fisher, Rt. Rev. Mgr. N. F.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Foy, Rev. Francis	Nutley, N. J.
Hurley, T. D.	Chicago, Ill.
Johann, Frank J.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kennedy, James F.	Chicago, Ill.
Kerby, Rev. Dr. Wm. J.	Washington, D. C.
McEvoy, P. J.	Baltimore, Md.
McKenna, Dr. Chas. F.	New York City.
McMahon, Rt. Rev. Mgr. D. J.	New York City.
Monaghan, Rev. Hugh G.	Baltimore, Md.
Mulry, Thomas M.	New York City.
Neill, Dr. Charles P.	Washington, D. C.
O'Connor, Rev. Dr. M. J.	Boston, Mass.
Rapier, Thomas G.	New Orleans, La.
Rea, John	Philadelphia, Pa.
Shahan, Rt. Rev. T. J.	Washington, D. C.
Tilley, David F.	Boston, Mass.
White, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Wm. J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.

Vice-Presidents.

Mr. Thomas Mulry,	New York.
Mr. Thomas Rapier,	New Orleans.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Anderson,	Boston.
Mrs. Thomas H. Carter,	of Montana.
Mr. James F. Kennedy,	Chicago.

The following are the newly elected officers :

Honorary President : His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons.

President : Rt. Rev. Monsignor T. J. Shahan.

Treasurer : Hon. Wm. H. De Lacy.

Secretary : Rev. Dr. Wm. J. Kerby.

Executive Committee.

Rt. Rev. Monsignor Shahan, Chairman, Washington, D. C.

Rev. Dr. Wm. J. Kerby, Secretary, Washington, D. C.

Butler, Edmond J. New York City.

Boyle, Rev. P. H. Little Rock, Ark.

Carpenter, Hon. Paul Milwaukee, Wis.

Crane, Richard	Cincinnati, O.
Flaherty, James A.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Conner, Lawrence	Dubuque, Iowa.
Hisky, Thomas Foley	Baltimore, Md.
MacMahon, Mrs. John	Chicago, Ill.
Molamphy, Mrs. J. M.	Pittsburg, Pa.
Murphy, Daniel B.	Rochester, N. Y.
Ryan, Rev. Dr. John A.	St. Paul, Minn.
Taylor, Mrs. Thomas	Austin, Texas.
Tilley, David F.	Boston, Mass.
Waldo, Miss Eveline A.	New Orleans, La.
Wingenter, Dr. Chas.	Wheeling, W. Va.

Vice-Presidents.

De Courcy, Hon. Chas. A.	.	.	.	Lawrence, Mass.
Desmond, C. C.	.	.	.	Los Angeles, Cal.
Grehan, John A.	.	.	.	New Orleans, La.
Hagan, John C.	.	.	.	Richmond, Va.
Kelly, Mrs. Thomas F.	.	.	.	New York City.
Kennedy, James F.	.	.	.	Chicago, Ill.

PROGRAM.

I.

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 25TH.

Formal Opening.

10 A. M. High Mass in the presence of the Apostolic Delegate, at Catholic University. Sermon by Most Rev. Archbishop Blenk of New Orleans.

11.15 A. M. The delegates to the Conference will be received by His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, and Right Rev. Monsignor Shahan, President of the Conference and Rector of the Catholic University.

3 P. M. Organization and appointment of Committees.

8 P. M. Public meeting in the city of Washington to be presided over by His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons. Columbia Theatre, 12th and F Streets, N. W. Addresses: Welcome, Hon. Cuno H. Rudolph, President of the Board of Commissioners, D. C.; the Practical Mission of the Conference, Rt. Rev. Monsignor Shahan; Catholic Ideals in Charity, Judge M. O'Doherty, Judge of the Jefferson Circuit Court of Louisville, Ky.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26TH.

9.30 A. M. Presentation and discussion of reports on the condition of Catholic Charities in cities, dioceses and states.

P. M. Discussion of reports continued and concluded.

2 P. M. Meeting of Heads of Industrial Schools to effect organization.

8 P. M. Section A. The State and Charity. 1. The State and Private Institutions, Mr. David F. Tilley, Boston, Pres. Particular Council St. Vincent de Paul Society ; Member Mass. State Board of Charity ; Pres. Mass. State Conference of Charities ; 1st Vice-Pres. National Conference of Charities and Correction. 2. Recognition of the Religion of Dependents by the State, Mr. Paul Fuller of New York. 3. Natural Rights of Dependents, Rev. Dr. J. W. Melody, Professor of Moral Theology in the Catholic University.

8½ P. M. Section B. The Protection of Young Girls in our large

1. Report on the International Association for the Protection of Young Girls, Rev. P. Mueller-Simonis, of Strassburg. 2. Reports from city committees on dangers to which young girls are exposed. 3. Informal discussion of the work of Protection, etc.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27TH.

9.30 A. M. The Dependent Family. 1. The Problems presented by the Dependent Family, Mr. Robert Biggs, Baltimore ; Pres. Particular Council St. Vincent de Paul Society ; Member Municipal Commission for the Prevention of Tuberculosis. 2. Two hours' discussion of the paper, each speaker to have 10 minutes.

1.30 P. M. Excursion to points of interest about the City of Washington under the direction of local committees.

8 P. M. The Church and Social Reform. 1. The Reform Problems which the Church should meet, Monsignor William J. White, Diocesan Director of Charities, Brooklyn. 2. The Catholic Lay Man and Social Reform, Very Rev. Joseph McSorley, C. S. P., New York. 3. The Church and the Social Conscience, Mr. Thos. Woodlock, New York.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28TH.

9.30 A. M. Delinquency. 1. Problems in Delinquency, Hon. Michael F. Girtan, Judge in the Municipal Court of Chicago. 2. Two hours' discussion of the paper, each speaker to have 10 minutes.

1.30 P. M. Permanent Organization of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. Reports of Committees. Election of Officers. Adjournment.

II.

Additional Papers. The program of formal sessions was confined to a few fundamental topics in order to secure thorough treatment and wide discussion. The committee desired, however, to widen the scope of the Conference and strengthen its appeal to our charity workers. On that account provision was made for the preparation of a number of papers which will serve as the basis of informal discussion. The printed text of these papers was placed in the hands of delegates immediately upon their arrival. The following papers were presented :

Institutional Care of Children. V. Rev. James Sullivan, C. M., Superior of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Emmitsburg, Md.

Boarding out of Children. Mr. James E. Fee, Superintendent of State Minor Wards, Boston, Mass.

Placing out of Children. Mr. William J. Doherty, Executive Secretary, Catholic Home Bureau, New York.

Fresh Air Homes. Mr. Joseph W. Brooks, Chairman Summer Home Committee ; Member of Executive Board of St. Mary's Industrial School, Baltimore.

Probation. Mr. Timothy D. Hurley, Editor *Juvenile Court Record*, Chicago. Author of History of Juvenile Court Law of Illinois.

The Big Brother. Mr. Patrick Mallon, Probation Officer at Brooklyn Children's Court.

Coöperation with the Juvenile Court. Mr. A. B. Reid, Chairman Knights of Columbus, Juvenile Court Association, Pittsburg.

Day Nurseries. Mrs. Thomas Hughes Kelly, Chairman Committee on Day Nurseries of the Association of Catholic Charities, New York.

Friendly Visiting. Miss Teresa R. O'Donohue, Corresponding Secretary Association of Catholic Charities, New York.

Social Settlements. Miss Grace O'Brien, Member of Board of Managers of the District Nurses of Brooklyn ; Chairman Catholic Settlement Association.

The Hygiene of the Home. Mrs. James J. Ryan, Pres. Ladies' Auxiliary St. Vincent de Paul Society, Baltimore.

Purchase and Preparation of Food. Mrs. Mary Gaynor Wilson, Chairman Philanthropy Section Catholic Women's League, Chicago.

The Hospital Dispensary. Dr. Thomas F. Leen, Member Medical Staff, Carney Hospital ; Member St. Vincent de Paul Society, Boston.

Tuberculosis Among the Poor. Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, Pres. Free Hospital for Poor Consumptives and White Haven Sanitarium Asso-

ciation ; Organizer and ex-Medical Director of the Henry Phipps Institute for the Study, Treatment and Prevention of Tuberculosis ; Organizer and ex-President of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis ; ex-Chairman of the Committee of the International Congress on Tuberculosis ; ex-President of the International Society for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, Philadelphia.

Legal Aid for the Poor. Mr. Bernard Fox, Cincinnati.

Temperance Work Among the Poor. V. Rev. Peter J. O'Callaghan, C. S. P., National Pres. of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America.

Prison Visiting. Mr. A. A. Boyle, Second Vice-Pres. American Society for Visiting Catholic Prisoners, Philadelphia.

Organized Catholic Charities. Mr. John Marron, Member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, Pittsburg.

Care of the Unemployed. Mr. William F. Downey, Founder of Good Samaritan Home, Washington.

State Boards of Charity. Rev. Francis H. Gavisk, Member Board of State Charities of Indiana, Indianapolis.

Schools of Philanthropy. Mrs. P. J. Toomey, Member Board of Directors, St. Louis School of Social Economy ; Cor. Sec'y and Member of General Council Daughters of the Queen of Heaven.

Loss of Faith Among the Poor. V. Rev. A. P. Doyle, C. S. P., Rector Apostolic Mission House, Washington.

Loss of Faith Among the Poor. Rev. John T. McNicholas, O. P., New York.

Loss of Faith Among the Poor. A Franciscan Father.

The members of the Committees who prepared reports on the problem of Protection of Young Girls in large Cities, are as follows :

Boston. Miss Mary Josephine Bleakie, Sec'y Guild of St. Elizabeth ; President Cecilian Sewing Club ; Sec'y Non-Support Conference, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children ; Executive Officer, League of Catholic Women ; Member Lodging House Commission of Boston in 1908 ; Miss Mary A. Maynard, Ass't Probation Officer, Municipal Court ; Miss Ellen McGurty, Ass't Probation Officer, Municipal Court, formerly Representative of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in the Care of Immigrant Girls.

New York. Miss Teresa R. O'Donahue, Sec'y Association of Catholic Charities ; Miss Francis E. Leitch, Probation Officer, Brooklyn ; Miss Hanway, Member Childrens' Court Committee.

Philadelphia. Mrs. A. G. Prince, Investigator for Catholic Charities.

Pittsburg. Miss Alice G. Carter, Juvenile Court Probation Officer.
Detroit. Mrs. Charles Cosgrave, Member Girls' Protective League.
Chicago. Miss Mary Mossett, Supervisor, Home for Friendless Women and Girls; Miss Julia Gleason in charge Paulist Relief Work.
Cincinnati. Mrs. Napoleon DuBrul, President St. James Fresh Air Home.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC CHARITIES, AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY,
SEPTEMBER 25-28, 1910.

Be it Resolved, that the hearty thanks of the First National Conference of Catholic Charities are hereby extended to the Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., Rector of the Catholic University of America, and to Reverend Dr. William J. Kerby, Professor of Sociology at the Catholic University of America, for their prompt acceptance of the suggestion of Reverend Brother Barnabas, Superior of the Lincolndale Agricultural Institute for Boys, that a National Conference of Catholic Charities be called ;

Be it Further Resolved, that we express our grateful appreciation to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, His Excellency Monsignor Falconio, Papal Delegate; to Most Reverend Archbishop Blenk, Right Reverend Bishop Collins, Right Reverend Monsignor D. J. McMahon, Right Reverend William J. White and Monsignor Paul Muller-Simonis, of Strassburg, Germany, for the inspiration of their presence and their participation in our exercises ;

Be it Further Resolved, that thanks also be extended to the Washington Committee on Reception for their generous hospitality and their thoughtfulness in providing a trip to Mount Vernon, the home of Washington, which will long remain a happy memory :

Be it Further Resolved, that thanks also be extended to the secular Press for its uniform courtesy and fairness, and to the Catholic Press for its cordial endorsement and continued support of our plans and aims ;

Be it Further Resolved, that the hearty thanks of the First National Conference of Catholic Charities be extended to the Very Reverend Doctor A. P. Doyle, Rector of The Apostolic Mission House, for hospitality and other courtesies so generously extended to the delegates, and to the Mother Superior and the other Sisters of Trinity College for their constant interest in the Conference and for their generosity in placing commodious office quarters at the service of the Secretary while

the Conference was in course of preparation ; for the use of the Auditorium for the Conference and many other pleasant attentions ; to the Sisters of Charity of the Providence Hospital, for the trained nurses in attendance to accommodate the visitors ; to the Catholic University of America for its accommodations and hospitality ; to Doctor Thomas F. Mallan for his services as physician, and last, to all who contributed so materially to the success of the Conference either by subscribing the necessary funds, by the preparation of papers, or by participating in the discussions ; and

Be it Further Resolved, that the First National Conference of Catholic Charities would look with favor upon the establishment of some form of periodical of national scope devoted to the Catholic Charities of the United States, in the broadest sense of the term, and that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee for their consideration ; and

Whereas, The conversion of our non-Catholic fellow citizens of the United States to our glorious Catholic faith immeasurably transcends in magnitude and in difficulty every other work of Charity to be done, and

Whereas, The great White Shepherd of the Christian world, the Holy Father, has approved and blessed in a special manner the Church Extension Movements, which have for their specific object the conversion of America ; therefore

Be it Further Resolved, first, that we, the members of the First Conference of Catholic Charities, in convention assembled, imitating the example of the Holy Father, extend to all missionaries of our land who are striving for the conversion of America, our heartfelt sympathy, our best wishes and our prayers ;

Second. In particular we recommend to our brethren in the faith throughout the length and breadth of our glorious country—

1. The Catholic Missionary Union of the United States, whose Apostolic Mission House is in Washington, D. C. ;

2. The Missionary Union for the conversion of Indians and Negroes, with headquarters in New York City ; and

3. The Catholic Church Extension Society of America.

JAMES E. FEE,
RICHARD M. REILLY,
WILLIAM H. DELACY, *Chairman*,

Committee on Resolutions.

LETTER OF HIS EMINENCE THE CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY.

I take great pleasure in bringing to your attention the excellent condition of the Catholic University as shown in the Rector's Annual Report. You will observe that the endowment is now larger than ever before, a result that will be gladly welcomed by our people whose generosity has placed the University on its present financial basis. During the past year several instructors have been added to the teaching corps and the registration for the academic year just opened shows a considerable increase in the number of students. It is very gratifying to note that this increase is largely in the School of Science, in that section of the University which offers to our young Catholic laymen a career as chemists, engineers, architects, etc., that is, the advantages of education along practical lines.

A further evidence of prosperity is the steadily growing number of Catholic colleges and high schools whose graduates enter the University for advanced studies, thus corresponding with the oft-expressed wishes of Pope Leo XIII, the founder of the University, and of His Holiness Pius X who has manifested the deepest interest in this great work and in his recent Encyclical has uttered a timely warning against the dangers to faith which so many of the purely secular institutions present. Through the University we are thus enabled to realize more and more completely the scope so wisely appointed by the Holy See for this work ; and we have therefore abundant reason to thank Almighty God and to implore His blessing upon the faithful in our various dioceses who have so nobly furthered our efforts in this holy cause.

As the University owes its prosperity and growth to the liberality of our people, it was but fitting that it should welcome to its halls the representatives of Catholic charity from every section of our country, assembled this year for the first time in a national conference. It is indeed significant that this movement which is destined to benefit so many of our people and to advance the work of charity in all directions, should have been inaugurated in the University. This fact of itself suffices to show that in building up the University we are at the same time establishing a center of Catholic life from which new impulses and new forces will go out continuously to every part of the land and supply our manifold needs. That these needs will become more numer-

ous and more urgent each year is what we may naturally expect. To meet them adequately, the University should be fully developed in order that it may train men to initiate and carry on as competent leaders the work of coöperation and organization. The very fact that the Church's activity is spread out over so vast a territory, that the interests of religion are so varied, and that the problems to which they give rise are so complex, makes it plain that the University should be built up on a scale proportioned to all these requirements.

I am confident that this much-deserved development has already been well begun and that the reciprocal action of our Catholic people and their University will result in the greatest benefit for both.

In my own name, therefore, and in that of the Board of Trustees, I appeal to you and to your generous clergy and people for a continuance of the support you have so loyally given us in the past. No form of Catholic charity is more noble or more fruitful than that which is given to education in all its degrees, and nowhere can the generous giver better bestow his gifts than on an institution destined under Divine Providence to confer on all our people such lasting religious and educational benefits as the Catholic University. To multiply its schools and departments, to increase the number of its professors and instructors, to make provision there for every kind of useful learning, to enrich its libraries, equip its laboratories, and provide for teachers and students all necessary facilities, should be our pride. Generations to come will bless us for the open-handed generosity and the far-seeing wisdom with which we supported the young institution during the first decades of its life, when affectionate help and practical good-will are more valuable than in the days of triumph and success.

In accordance with the directions given by the Holy Father, the annual collection for the University should be taken up on the first Sunday of Advent, or on the first Sunday thereafter which may be selected by the Bishop for this purpose.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

J. CARD, GIBBONS,

Chancellor of the Catholic University of America.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Meeting of the Board of Trustees. The Fall meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University took place on November 16th. Of the twenty-three members composing the Board, the following were present : His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, Most Reverend Patrick John Ryan, Most Reverend John Ireland, Most Reverend John Murphy Farley, Most Reverend Henry Moeller, Most Reverend James Edward Quigley, Most Reverend John Joseph Glennon, Right Reverend Camillus Paul Maes, Right Reverend Matthew Harkins, Right Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Lavelle, Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas Joseph Shahan and Mr. Walter George Smith. To the two vacancies on the Board must now be added the name of Mr. Michael Cudahy of Chicago. Among the important measures passed by the Board of Trustees was one concerning the establishment of a Normal College or Institute for the better training of our Teaching Sisters. The Board of Trustees has had this matter under consideration for several years, and has now decided that the time seems propitious for the establishment of such a school. It is accepted in principle that the University approves the idea of founding at Washington a Normal College or Institute for the more perfect formation of our Teaching Sisters, and also of such of our Catholic lay-women as may desire to follow the courses in this Institute. The Institute, when founded, will be under the general guidance of the University and will profit by the services of many members of the Professorial staff of the University. It is hoped that generous friends of the Teaching Sisters of our parochial schools will come to their aid and in the near future enable them to put on a solid footing, in the close neighborhood of the University, this very desirable Institute. Once established each teaching congregation or distinct community can send one or more of its teachers to the new Institute, where they may profit by the advantages of the University, while observing strictly the religious life. All instruction will, of course, be given within the Institute, which would thus have its own religious and educational life. A similar enterprise, St. Anne's Institute at Muenster, in Germany, has been in operation for more than ten years, under the immediate direction of the Bishop of Muenster, with the coöperation of all the Catholic Bishops of Prussia. It has already rendered incalculable

services to the female teaching Orders of Catholic Germany, and is held to be one of the principal elements of Catholic educational progress in Germany at the present time.

As Albert Hall is filled this year to overflowing, the Board of Trustees authorized the immediate erection of a Dormitory for lay students, with a capacity of about one hundred, costing in the neighborhood of One Hundred Thousand Dollars. This building, however, will be only one section of a larger edifice, destined to accommodate two hundred and fifty students, at a cost of about Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars. The growth of the lay students in the University, particularly in the new School of Science, calls for a considerable material development in the near future. It is proposed, before long, to erect a new Institute of Chemistry, the present laboratories on the third floor of McMahon Hall being no longer capable of handling the increasing number of students in a satisfactory way.

The Board of Trustees also considered the question of erecting on the University campus a commodious chapel for the lay students, with a seating capacity of seven or eight hundred. It is confidently hoped that before long the University will be provided with such a suitable center of religious and devotional life. As it is, the beautiful but small chapel in Divinity Hall is incapable of containing the entire student body, and all the more solemn services are henceforth necessarily held in the Assembly Room of McMahon Hall.

Solemn Opening of the University. The solemn opening of the academic year at the Catholic University of America took place on Sunday morning, October 9th. The entire student body, including the members of the religious houses affiliated with the University, assembled together with their professors in McMahon Hall for the Solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost, of which the Rector, Monsignor Shahan, was the celebrant, and at the close of which he addressed words of welcome to all.

Visit of Cardinal Vannutelli. On the occasion of his visit to Washington, September 30th, Cardinal Vannutelli was the guest of Monsignor Shahan at a dinner at which some sixty persons were present, including the professors who had returned, the superiors of the religious houses, the pastors of Washington and other invited guests. After dinner the Legate and his suite went to the Assembly Room in McMahon Hall where the students of the religious orders were gathered. They were presented to His Eminence by the Right Reverend Rector and were privileged to hear from the distinguished visitor warm words of encouragement.

Conference of Catholic Charities. The same week the University entertained more than four hundred delegates, men and women, who had come to attend the First National Conference of Catholic Charities. They had gathered from all sections of the country, representing every phase of charitable endeavor, and their papers and discourses aroused an interest and an enthusiasm which carried the Conference to an issue successful beyond all expectations. Dr. William J. Kerby, professor of Sociology at the University, was Secretary of the Conference and to his untiring efforts may be attributed much of its success.

Summer Lectures. During the summer months many of the professors of the University were engaged in educational work in various parts of the country. Dr. Kerby delivered a series of five lectures at the Western Summer School under the auspices of the Central-Verein. At the Catholic Summer School at Cliff Haven, New York, Drs. Pace, Shields and Turner gave an extensive and interesting course on the history, principles and methods of education. Dr. Shields also conducted Summer Institutes for our teaching Sisterhoods in many sections of the country, including Rochester, Minn. (12 lectures); Watertown, N. Y. (24); St. Mary's of the Woods, Terre Haute, Ind. (24); Springfield, Mass. (24); and Boston (24). At each of these centers a large number of Sisters had gathered, representing the schools and academies of their respective communities, so that by this means the work of the Department of Education is extended over a very wide area, and the influence of the University reaches a multitude of teachers, who cannot follow its courses during the academic year. Earlier in the summer the degree of LL. D. was conferred upon the Rector by Manhattan College and on Dr. Pace by Notre Dame University at the respective commencements of these institutions.

Registration of Students. This year the registration of students far surpasses that of any other year, the increase taking place not only in the theological school but also, and more especially, in the graduate and undergraduate schools of the lay department. The School of Science seems to be attracting the larger number and promises in the next few years to be very successful. One hundred and ten students are now enrolled in this school, all pursuing their studies with a view to obtaining the B. S. or Ph. D. degree in Engineering (Civil, Chemical, Mechanical or Electrical), in Architecture, Chemistry, Physics, or Mathematics. Directing the work of these students and attending to their interests is an able staff of professors and instructors, each of whom gives his entire time to the particular science he represents.

Department of Physics and Chemistry. Two of the most important departments in the University are those of Chemistry and of Physics. The Very Rev. John J. Griffin, Ph. D., Dean of the School of Science, is in charge of the Chemistry Department and this year has been given two assistants—in Chemistry, Mr. Henry Froning, A. B., and in Metallurgy and Assaying Mr. Clarence Baltzley. The courses in Physics are conducted by Dr. Daniel W. Shea, assisted by Mr. Louis H. Crook, who received the B. S. degree from the Catholic University in 1909. Both these Departments, with their laboratories constructed originally for a comparatively small number of students, have long since outgrown their original quarters, carrying as they do at present from two to three times as many students as at first arranged for, so that a more generous provision for Chemistry and Physics will soon be a necessity. In the Department of Civil Engineering which has enrolled more than forty students, a new professor has been appointed in the person of Mr. Fred. J. Merriman, to succeed Mr. Francis J. Thompson who has resigned to take up a position as Patent Examiner, but who will still continue to reside in Albert Hall as Proctor of that College, and also give instruction in mechanical drawing to first year students of Civil Engineering. Mr. Merriman comes very highly recommended by President Maclaurin of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from which he graduated in 1904, and he has had much experience in railroad work throughout New England, Florida, and the Philippines. In Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, classes will be conducted in very convenient and spacious lecture rooms on the second floor of the large brick structure now nearing completion to serve as a central heating and lighting plant.

Course in Architecture. This year the University has made an important new departure by adding to its School of Sciences a course in Architecture, leading to a degree of B. S. in this branch. The professor of this new course is Mr. Frederick V. Murphy, one of the most efficient architects on the staff of the supervising architect's office in the Treasury Department. Mr. Murphy is a graduate of the famous Paris school of architecture known as the "Ecole des Beaux Arts," and one of the few American students who have gained this coveted honor. Already several students are at work under his direction, looking forward to the B. S. degree in architecture after the usual four years' course of study. There is no reason why henceforth young men desiring to become architects, should not find under Catholic auspices the necessary preliminary training and that, too, in a city which for many reasons is an ideal place of study for students in architecture.

School of Letters. In the School of Letters additional instructors have become necessary. Dr. John D. Maguire, professor of Latin Language and Literature, has received an assistant in Rev. James J. O'Connor, S. T. L. (Catholic University, 1908). Father O'Connor will act as instructor to the undergraduates while continuing his duties as assistant pastor of St. Augustine's Church in Washington. In the Greek Department Dr. George M. Bolling will be assisted by Dr. Charles W. Dales; he will have charge of the first and second year students of the undergraduate school.

Department of Oriental Languages. The large number of students applying for admission to the School of Oriental Languages has made necessary an addition to the Faculty in this Department. Reverend Arthur A. Vaschalde, S. T. L. (Catholic University, 1895) and Ph. D. (Catholic University, 1901), who for the last seven years has been professor of Philosophy at St. Michael's College in Toronto and is a disciple of Dr. Hyvernât, professor of Semitic Languages and Biblical Archaeology, has been appointed instructor in Semitic Languages and is now conducting classes in Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, and Assyrian. Dr. Vaschalde is one of the best known specialists in Syriac and is a prominent collaborator of the "*Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium*" published at Paris. In that famous collection of ancient Christian Oriental writings he is now publishing, together with the original text, a Latin translation of the works of Philoxenus of Mablogh, a fifth century Nestorian writer on the Trinity and the Incarnation. The latest work of Dr. Vaschalde is the editing of the Syriac text and Latin translation of Babai's "*Book of the Universe*" (Paris, 1910). With Dr. Hyvernât and Dr. Vaschalde, the University is sure that its Department of Oriental Studies is not outranked by any similar institution in the country.

Department of Education. In the Department of Education there is a very efficient staff of professors. This School is under the immediate direction of Very Rev. Dr. Edward A. Pace, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, who, assisted by Rev. Dr. Thomas V. Moore, C. S. P., lectures on Psychology. This year the Rev. P. J. McCormick, S. T. L. (Catholic University, 1906), for several years Superintendent of parochial schools in the diocese of Hartford, has been made instructor in school management and will also lecture on the history of education, assisting Rev. Dr. William Turner. The principles and methods of education are taught by Rev. Dr. Thomas

E. Shields, well known for his zealous interest in all that pertains to the systematizing of Catholic education. These courses are becoming very popular at the University, in particular for young priests who later on find the training extremely profitable to them either as diocesan Supervisors of Catholic education or as assistant Pastors in places with large parochial schools.

Department of English Literature. Another new member has been added to the staff of University professors in the person of Mr. Francis J. Hemelt of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Mr. Hemelt will act as instructor in the English Department, and this year will give to the undergraduates a solid training in rhetoric and prose composition and to the graduate students a course in Anglo-Saxon and in Chaucerian English. The usual graduate course, including the student dissertations for degrees, will be conducted by Professor P. J. Lennox, B. A. (Royal University of Ireland). Professor Lennox is not only one of the best known teachers of English that Ireland has produced but he is also a polished and versatile writer as evidenced by his brilliant editorials in the *Washington Post*. During the past summer Professor Lennox was appointed by Secretary Nagel of the Department of Commerce and Labor as a special agent to investigate trade conditions abroad, and Secretary Knox of the Department of State further honored him by sending him as a delegate to represent the United States at the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce held in London last June.

Other Improvements. From this outline of the various activities of the University it will be seen that excellent opportunities for a first class education are open for the Catholic young men who attend the foremost Catholic school in our country. A large staff of competent teachers are in charge of their training and at their disposal is a library of 70,000 volumes. Physical education is not neglected. A new gymnasium is now under construction and will soon be open to the student body. The athletic field, which has been set off from the extensive campus, has been considerably enlarged during the past summer so that all needed advantages are within the reach of the various athletic teams which came strongly to the front during the last scholastic year.

School of Theology. In the school of Theology the same rapid growth can be observed. For the first time in its history Caldwell Hall is filled to overflowing. Every room in this large building, which

serves as a home for ecclesiastical students, is taken, so much so that the University has been obliged to seek quarters for its students elsewhere on the grounds. Through the kindness of Rev. A. P. Doyle, President of the Apostolic Mission House, a number of rooms have been placed at the disposal of the Rector to accommodate students who came to pursue studies in the School of Theology. Besides the forty ecclesiastical students now residing in Caldwell Hall, there are also fourteen ecclesiastical professors, so that the capacity of this Hall is now taxed to its utmost and it would seem that the time is approaching when this building should be finished according to the original designs. In the department of Sacred Sciences a new instructor has been added to the staff, Rev. Joseph P. Munday, S. T. L. (Catholic University, 1910), of the diocese of Alton. Father Munday has been appointed by the Rector to the Thomas Sim Lee Fellowship in Theology, founded by Mgr. Lee, pastor of St. Matthew's Church in Washington, and he will also act as an instructor in Dogmatic Theology. Father Munday is a brilliant graduate of St. Viator's College, Bourbonnais, Illinois, and won high honors during his studies at the University for the degree of *Licentiate*.

Rev. P. J. Waters. Another of last year's students, Rev. P. J. Waters of the Archdiocese of Boston, has returned to the University, being appointed private Secretary to the Rector to succeed Very Rev. George A. Dougherty, D. D., recently elevated by the Board of Trustees to the Vice-Rectorship of the University. Father Waters spent two years at the University as a student in the Department of Education. He has recently been appointed by the Rector to the Anna Hope Hudson Fellowship in Philosophy and is now a candidate for the Ph. D. degree, having received his Ph. M. last June.

Ecclesiastical Music. Rev. Abel Gabert of Morristown, N. J., and previously for thirteen years organist and choir master at Neuilly, Paris, has come to the University to direct the musical formation of the ecclesiastical students. He will be the instructor in Ecclesiastical Music and also serve as the organist at the University chapel. Shortly after the opening of the year's work the choir under his direction assisted at the Requiem Mass which was celebrated by the Rt. Rev. Rector for the repose of the soul of Very Rev. Anthony Walburg, R. D., of Cincinnati, Ohio. Father Walburg was a generous benefactor of the University and the founder of the Chair of German Language and Literature.

Gift to the Museum. With the return of the students to the University there came also a very interesting gift in the shape of a little box of olive berries and leaves sent from Athens by a friend. These berries and leaves are from the so-called "Olive Tree of Plato," one of the objects of interest in Athens and said to date from the days of Plato and Pericles. Recently this venerable trunk, though long apparently dead and exhausted, put forth foliage and fruit, specimens of which have been sent to the principal universities of Europe and America and to all well-wishers of Greece. The gift will be placed in the University museum, now occupying new quarters in McMahon Hall.

Albert Hall Notes. The first annual inner-class track and field meet was held on University Field, Tuesday, October 15th, and proved to be the crowning success of the year in athletics. It marked the inauguration of class spirit and gave ample assurance that a day will be set aside in the university calendar for these events. Worthy of praise was the manner in which the individual contestants strove with might and main to wrest victory for their respective classes. That our undergraduates are possessed with athletic ability goes without saying.

The Senior class carried off the honors of the day by annexing a total of 33 points, two more than the number won by the Freshmen. The Sophomores won third place with 26 points, no Juniors having been entered in the meet. By these scores the relative strength of the competing classes may be fairly judged, and it was not until the last runner in the final race had breasted the tape that the victors were secure.

At the last meeting of the athletic association, the Senior class was presented with a handsome plaque of unusual design and beauty in token of their conquest. John J. Daly, wearing the colors of the Senior class, won the individual honors by carrying off 23 points. He was awarded a beautiful medal engraved with a seal of the University and inscription of the athletic association.

The Freshman Class held a meeting on November 18th to effect a permanent organization and to elect officers for the term of 1910-11. The following are those elected to hold office: Mr. L. Bond, President; Mr. R. E. Montgomery, Vice-President; Mr. J. R. Lambert, Secretary; Mr. H. M. Woodward, Jr., Treasurer; Mr. W. H. Furey, Sergeant-at-Arms.

Gifts to the Library. The Right Reverend Rector received recently the sum of One Thousand Dollars from a benefactor whose

name will be published later, for the purchase of books for the Library. From the Right Reverend Rector the Library received ten sets of Periodicals; from the Very Reverend Dr. Pace, Rein's *Encyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik*, in ten volumes; from Very Reverend Dr. Hyvernat, fifty-four volumes on Political Science and Mining Engineering, thirteen volumes of the *Revue d'économie chrétienne*, thirty-six volumes of the *Association Catholique* and a number of volumes of miscellaneous magazines; from Dr. Dunn, twenty-one volumes of Latin classics.

Public Lectures. The program of lectures given during the Fall Term at 4.30 p. m., in McMahon Hall is as follows:

October 20,—Rev. Charles W. Currier, Ph. D., Spanish American Literature.

October 27,—Rev. Charles W. Currier, Ph. D., South America: Its Peoples and its Problems.

November 3,—Mr. Frederick B. Wright, The Development of Writing and Printing.

November 10,—Joseph Dunn, Ph. D., Italian Literature before Dante.

November 17,—Rt. Rev. Maurice F. Burke, D. D., Dante and the Papacy.

December 1,—Rev. William Turner, D. D., Symbolism of Dante.

December 15,—Patrick J. Lennox, B. A., Some English Women Writers of the Fifteenth Century.

The Catholic Educational Review. Beginning with January, 1911, the Department of Education will publish a monthly review devoted to the interests of Catholic Education. It will be entitled the *Catholic Educational Review*. The hearty response that has been made to the first general appeal on behalf of the Review shows that the need of it is appreciated, and leaves no room for doubting that its success will be complete and immediate. The *Bulletin* hails with pleasure the appearance of this sister-publication, and wishes it prosperity and length of days.

Knights of Columbus Endowment Fund. The current number of the *Columbiad* reports that, up to date, 1,119 Councils out of 1,349 have reported in favor of the Catholic University Endowment Fund, and that cash to the amount of \$148,397.15 has already been paid into the Secretary's office. The thanks of the University and its friends

are due to the Committee consisting of Edward H. Doyle, Philip A. Hart and Supreme Knight James A. Flaherty, who have spared no effort to bring this great work to a happy termination.

Rev. Edward Southgate, late Pastor of St. Anthony's Church, Brookland, D. C., and now Chaplain of the Soldiers' Home, D. C., has presented to the University from the library of his father, Bishop Southgate, with the hearty assent of his family, several valuable sets of Oriental works, among which are 1) Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis* in 4 volumes, a very rare and very useful set ; 2) the *Lexicon Arabico-persico-turcicum* by Mininski, also in 4 volumes folio ; 3) an excellently preserved Persian manuscript of Ibn-Khâtûn's Commentary on the Jami Abbâsi, a famous Persian code of law compiled by order of Shah Abbas the Great.

